

## Section 11. Child Support Enforcement Program

### BACKGROUND

The enactment of the Child Support Enforcement (CSE) program in 1975 represented a major new commitment on the part of the Congress to address the problem of nonsupport of children. Although prior to that time the Social Security Act had included provisions which were aimed at improving the collection of support on behalf of children, these provisions had not proved to be effective. The 1975 amendments were aimed at strengthening in a very significant way the efforts of the Federal and State Governments to improve the enforcement of child support obligations.

The 1975 legislation (Public Law 93-647) added a new part D to title IV of the Social Security Act. The statute, as amended, authorizes Federal matching funds to be used for enforcing the support obligations owed by noncustodial parents to their children and the custodial parent, locating absent parents, establishing paternity, and obtaining child and spousal support. Basic responsibility for administering the program is left to the States, but the Federal Government plays a major role in funding, monitoring and evaluating State programs, providing technical assistance, and in certain instances, in giving direct assistance to the States in locating absent parents and obtaining support payments from them. The program requires the provision of child support enforcement services for both welfare and nonwelfare families and requires States to publicize frequently, through public service announcements, the availability of child support enforcement services, together with information about the application fee and a telephone number or address to be

used to  
obtain additional information.

#### PROGRAM TRENDS

Table 11-1 summarizes child support enforcement program trends since 1978. In 1993, \$2.2 billion was spent to collect \$9.0 billion. A sum of \$3.98 was collected for every \$1 of administrative expense. This was up by 38 percent from the low point of only \$2.89 per dollar of administrative expense in 1982. Also, 553,000 paternities were established; 4,481,000 absent parents were located; 1,038,000 support obligations were established; collections were made for an average of 2,827,000 cases, 241,880 families were removed from AFDC because of child support collections; and 12.0 percent of AFDC payments were saved as a result of child support enforcement.

Table 11-2 compares various measures of the effectiveness of the child support enforcement program between administrative data and census data. The first four rows of table 11-2 are from the Office of Child Support Enforcement and illustrate huge increases in total constant dollar collections, the number of absent parents located, and paternities and awards that were established between 1978 and 1989.

The bottom portion of the table based on census data presents an entirely different picture of the effectiveness of the child support enforcement program. For example, rather than having total real collections increase by 165 percent, it shows that total real collections increased by only 26 percent between 1978 and 1989. Other measures of effectiveness from

census data illustrate a similar picture.

One possible explanation for this different picture is that the official child support enforcement statistics are capturing collections that were being made anyway. Since income from census survey data tends to be underreported on household surveys, the truth may lie somewhere in between. To receive AFDC, mothers must assign their support rights to the AFDC agency. As a result, another problem with survey data is that AFDC mothers included in the CPS survey are asked only to report child support received and are not supposed to report any portion of their AFDC grant as child support, except for the \$50 pass-through.

The terms in table 11-2 from the Census are defined as follows. The term ``demographically eligible'' includes all women who are living with children under 21 years of age whose natural fathers are not living in the household. This includes ever-divorced (including remarried) or currently separated women. The percent with awards are the women with court-ordered payments. The reason the percent ``supposed to receive payment'' is different from the percent with awards is that some mothers awarded payments were not due them for the year in question.

#### DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS

A sizable and growing proportion of American households are families that consist only of a mother and her children. Between 1970 and 1992, the number of female-headed families with children under 18 increased 164 percent; the number of such two-parent families declined by 4 percent. As a result, by



Total administrative expenditures..				\$312	\$466	
\$612	\$723	\$814	\$941	\$1,066	\$1,171	\$1,363
\$1,606	\$1,804	\$1,995	\$2,241			
Federal.....				\$236	\$349	
\$459	\$507	\$571	\$633	\$750	\$804	\$938
\$1,061	\$1,212	\$1,343	\$1,517			
State.....				\$76	\$117	
\$153	\$216	\$243	\$308	\$316	\$366	\$426
\$545	\$593	\$652	\$724			
Federal incentive payments to States and localities.....				\$54	\$72	
\$107	\$134	\$145	\$158	\$185	\$222	\$266
\$264	\$278	\$299	\$339			
Average number of AFDC cases in which a collection was made.....				458	503	
597	647	684	582	609	621	658
701	755	831	873			
Average number of non-AFDC cases in which a collection was made.....				249	243	
448	547	654	786	934	1,083	1,247
1,363	1,555	1,749	1,954			
Number of parents located.....				454	643	
779	875	878	1,046	1,145	1,388	1,628
2,062	2,577	3,706	4,481			
Number of paternities established..				111	144	
173	219	232	245	269	307	339
393	472	516	553			
Number of support obligations established.....				315	374	
462	573	669	731	812	871	938
1,022	1,221	894	1,038			
Percent of AFDC assistance payments recovered through child support collections.....				(\3\)	5.2	
6.8	7.0	7.3	8.6	9.1	9.8	10.0
10.3	10.7	11.4	12.0			
Total child support collections per dollar of total administrative expenses.....				\$3.35	\$3.17	
\$2.89	\$3.29	\$3.31	\$3.45	\$3.68	\$3.93	\$3.84
\$3.74	\$3.82	\$3.99	\$3.98			

-----  
 -----  
 -----  
 \1\Adjusted for inflation using fiscal CPI.      \2\AFDC  
 collections are divided into State/Federal shares and  
 incentives are taken from the Federal share  
     thereby reducing the Federal amounts.      \3\Not  
 available.      \4\Data beginning in 1991 exclude  
 modifications of support orders.

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement.

TABLE 11-2.--COMPARISON OF MEASURES OF IV-D  
 EFFECTIVENESS WITH  
                     CENSUS CHILD SUPPORT DATA, 1978-89

		Year			
Percent					
Measure		change,			
		1978	1983	1985	1987
1989	1978-89				
-----					
-----					
From program					
statistics:					
Total collections					
(1989 dollars in					
billions)\1\.....					
\$5.3	165	\$2.0	\$2.5	\$3.1	\$4.3
Parents located					
(thousands).....					
1,624	258	454	831	878	1,145
Paternities					
established					
(thousands).....					
339	205	111	208	232	269
Awards established					
(thousands).....					
		315	496	669	812

936	197				
From Census surveys:					
	Total collections				
	(1989 dollars in				
	billions)\1\.....	\$8.9	\$8.8	\$8.3	\$10.9
\$11.2	26				
	IV-D collections				
	as percent of				
	total collections	23	28	37	39
47	104				
	Of demographically				
	eligible, percent				
	with awards.....	59	58	61	59
58	-2				
	Of demographically				
	eligible, percent				
	supposed to				
	receive payment..	48	46	50	51
50	4				
	Of demographically				
	eligible, percent				
	who received some				
	payment.....	35	35	37	39
37	6				
	Of mothers				
	supposed to				
	receive payment,				
	percent who				
	received full				
	amount.....	49	50	48	51
51	4				
	Percent of poor				
	female-headed				
	families with				
	child support or				
	alimony.....	\2\18.			
		6	NA	NA	26.0
26.9	\3\45				
	Child support and				
	alimony as a				
	percent of total				

	income received by poor female- headed families..	\2\4.7	NA	NA	5.5
5.8	\3\23 Percent of female- headed families with child support or alimony.....	\2\33. 9	NA	NA	35.8
37.4	\3\10 Child support and alimony as a percent of total income received by female-headed families.....	\2\7.4	NA	NA	6.8
7.7	\3\4				

-----  
-----  
 \1\Constant (1989) dollars using CPI.      \2\1979 data.  
 \3\Percentage  
 change 1979 to 1989.      NA--Not available.

Note.--Demographically eligible means women with own  
 children under 21  
 years of age living with them from an absent father.

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Child Support and  
 Alimony, Current  
 Population Reports, Series P-23, 1978, No. 112; 1983, No.  
 141; 1985,  
 No. 152; 1987, No. 67; and 1989, No. 173.

In 1992, nearly 46 percent of the 8.2 million families  
 maintained solely by the mother with children under 18, had  
 incomes below the poverty threshold. Almost 11 percent of  
 the  
 mothers of these poor children worked full-time, full-year.

In 1992, 17.6 million children (under 18) lived with  
 only



one parent, 114 percent more than in 1970. Even though the total number of children under 18 years old in the United States declined from 69.2 million in 1970 to 66 million in 1992, the number of children affected by divorce, separation, and unmarried status of mother continued to rise. Almost 27 percent of all children lived in a one-parent family in 1992, compared with 12 percent in 1970. A 1985 current population survey indicated that about 15 percent of children living in two-parent married-coupled families were living with a step-parent.

Of the 17.6 million children living with one parent, 88 percent lived with their mothers and 12 percent with their fathers. Between 1970 and 1992 the number of children living with only their fathers grew by 192 percent (from 748,000 to 2,182,000). The proportion of all children who lived with only their fathers rose from 1.1 percent to 3.3 percent.

The largest number of children in one-parent families had a parent who was divorced, followed by children whose parents were never married. In 1992, of the children who lived only with one parent, 37 percent had a parent who was divorced, 24 percent had a parent who was separated, and 34 percent had a parent who had never been married. The number of children living with a divorced parent has almost tripled since 1970, but the number with a never-married parent grew nearly elevenfold.

#### THE PROCESS OF CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT

Local family and domestic courts and administrative agencies handle the establishment and enforcement of child

support obligations according to Federal, State, and local laws. Working with the parents and considering the best interests of the children, the courts decide which parent will have custody of the children, the amount of the child support obligation of the noncustodial parent, the rights of access to the children by the noncustodial parent, and how the support obligation will be enforced.

The federally mandated child support enforcement program provides services aimed at locating absent parents, establishing paternity, establishing a support obligation, and enforcing the support obligation. The child support enforcement program does not provide services aimed at other issues between parents, such as property settlement, custody, and access to the children. These issues are handled by local courts with the help of private attorneys.

Any parent who needs help in locating an absent parent, establishing paternity, establishing a support obligation, or enforcing a support obligation may apply for services.

Parents receiving benefits under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program, the federally assisted foster care program or the Medicaid program automatically receive services.

Services are free to such recipients, but others are charged up to \$25 for services. States can charge fees on a sliding scale, pay the fee out of State funds or recover the fees from the noncustodial parent.

When a parent applies for child support enforcement

services, the following information aids the process: the name and address of the noncustodial parent; the absent parent's Social Security number; children's birth certificates; the child support order; the divorce decree or separation agreement; the name and address of the most recent employer of the noncustodial parent; the names of friends and relatives or organizations to which the noncustodial parent might belong; information about income and assets; and any other information about absent parents that might help the locating process. Once this information is provided, it is used in strictest confidence.

If the child support enforcement program cannot locate the noncustodial parent with the information provided by the custodial parent, it must try to locate the noncustodial parent through the State parent locator service. The State uses various information such as telephone directories, motor vehicle registries, tax files, and employment data. The State also can ask the Federal Parent Locator Service (FPLS) to locate the noncustodial parent. The FPLS can access data from the Social Security Administration, the Internal Revenue Service, the Selective Service System, the Department of Defense, the Veterans' Administration, and the National Personnel Records Center.

Under the Family Support Act of 1988 (P.L. 100-485), States are required to initiate the establishment of paternity for all children under the age of 18, including those for whom an action to establish paternity was previously dismissed because of the existence of a statute of limitations of less than

18

years. The act also sets paternity establishment standards for

the States, and encourages them to create simple civil procedures for establishing paternity in contested cases.

All

parties to a contested case may be required to submit to genetic testing. The Federal Government pays 90 percent of the

laboratory costs, and States may charge persons not receiving

AFDC for the cost of establishing paternity.

Under the Family Support Act of 1988, a State must use its

child support award guidelines in establishing the child support obligation of the noncustodial parent. Also, the State

must review and adjust individual awards every 3 years under

certain circumstances beginning October 13, 1993. Some States

base their guidelines on net income and others on gross income.

Some States factor in health care, day care, and extraordinary

expenses while other States allow for deviation from the guideline if an extraordinary expense is shown. States generally use one of three basic types of guidelines to determine award amounts. ``Income shares,'' which is based on

the combined income of both parents is used in 32 States;

``percentage-of-income,'' which is based on the number of eligible children, which is then used to determine a percentage

of the noncustodial parents' income to be paid in child support

is used in 17 States; and ``Melson-Delaware,'' which provides a

minimum self-support reserve for parents before the cost of rearing the children is prorated between the parents to determine the award amount is used in 3 States.

Local courts and child support enforcement agencies attempt to collect child support when the noncustodial parent does not pay. Under the Family Support Act of 1988, the State must impose wage withholding on the noncustodial parent in all newly issued or modified child support enforcement program cases. As of October 1, 1990, wage withholding will apply to all other newly issued child support orders beginning in 1994. Other techniques for enforcing support include regular billings, delinquency notices, liens on property, seizure and sale of property, reporting arrearages to credit agencies, garnishment of wages, and offsetting of State and Federal income taxes.

States might bring charges of criminal nonsupport against noncustodial parents if they cannot collect, or they might use civil or criminal contempt-of-court charges. These court proceedings usually involve much time because of court backlogs, delays, and continuances. Once a court decides the case, noncustodial parents often have been given probation or suspended sentences, and lower support payments and only partial payment of arrearages. To combat problems associated with court delays, the statute requires States to implement expedited processes under the State judicial system or State administrative processes for obtaining and enforcing support orders and at State option for establishing paternity.

The most difficult child support orders to enforce are the interstate cases. States are required to cooperate in interstate child support enforcement, but problems arise from

the additional autonomy of the local courts. Family law has been under the jurisdiction of State and local governments, and citizens fall under the jurisdiction of the courts where they live.

If the noncustodial parent lives out of State, the primary tool for interstate enforcement is the Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act (URESA). All States have their own URESA laws. Under these laws, the child support enforcement official or private attorney files a two-State petition with the enforcement agency or a court in another State. Where the URESA provisions in the two States are compatible, the law can be used effectively. However, many of these laws are out of date and incompatible, which makes interstate child support enforcement relatively ineffective.

The National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws originally drafted a model URESA in 1950. Since then, amendments have been made in 1952, 1958, and 1968. The Family Support Act of 1988 authorized a commission to study problems in interstate child support enforcement. One of the Commission's recommendations to Congress is to replace URESA with UIFSA, the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act, a model State law for handling child support cases drafted by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws.

#### Child support awards

In 1989, of the 10.0 million women who had children present under the age of 21 from a noncustodial father, 42 percent

never were awarded child support rights (nor had an agreement to receive child support payments) and, thus, were dependent for income on sources other than the father. For poor mothers, the proportion without child support awards was even higher at 57 percent (see table 11-4).

TABLE 11-3.--CHILD SUPPORT PAYMENTS IN 1978, 1981, 1983, 1985, 1987, AND 1989

[Women as of spring 1979, 1982, 1984, 1986, 1988, and 1990. Child support payments for women with own children under 21 years of age present from an

absent

father: alimony payment for ever-divorced women]

-----  
-----  
-----

Number (thousands)  
distribution

Percent

-----  
-----

1978	1981	1983	1985	1987	1989	1978
1981	1983	1985	1987	1989		

-----  
-----  
-----

Total.....						
7,094	8,387	8,690	8,808	9,415	9,955	100.0
100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0		

-----  
-----

Awarded\1\.....						
4,196	4,969	5,015	5,396	5,554	5,748	59.1
59.2	57.7	61.3	59.0	57.7		

Supposed to receive payments.....							
3,424	4,043	3,995	4,381	4,829	4,953	48.3	
48.2	46.0	49.7	51.3	49.8			
Not supposed to receive payments.....							
772	926	1,020	1,015	725	795	10.9	11.0
11.7	11.5	7.7	8.0				
Not awarded\1\.....							
2,898	3,417	3,675	3,411	3,861	4,207	40.9	
40.7	42.3	38.7	41.0	42.3			

Supposed to receive payments.....							
3,424	4,043	3,995	4,381	4,829	4,953	100.0	
100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0			
Actually received payments.....							
2,455	2,902	3,037	3,243	3,676	3,725	71.6	
71.8	76.0	74.0	76.1	75.2			
Received full amount.....							
1,675	1,888	2,018	2,112	2,475	2,546	48.9	
46.7	50.5	48.2	51.3	51.4			
Received partial amount.....							
779	1,014	1,019	1,131	1,201	1,179	22.8	25.1
25.5	25.8	24.9	23.8				
Did not receive payments.....							
969	1,140	958	1,138	1,153	1,228	28.4	28.2
24.0	26.0	23.9	24.8				

-----  
 -----  
 -----  
 \1\Award status as of spring 1979, 1984, 1986, 1988, and 1990.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports, Series P-23, No. 112 Child Support and Alimony 1978, No. 141 Child Support and Alimony 1983 (advance report), No. 152 Child Support and Alimony 1985 (advance report), No. 167 Child Support and Alimony: 1987, and No. 173 Child Support and Alimony: 1989. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office.



TABLE 11-4.--CHILD SUPPORT PAYMENTS FOR ALL WOMEN,  
WOMEN ABOVE THE POVERTY LEVEL, AND WOMEN BELOW THE  
POVERTY LEVEL, SELECTED  
YEARS 1978-89

[Child support payments for women with own children under  
21 years of age present from an absent father as of  
spring 1979, 1982, 1984,  
1986, 1988, and 1990]

1978	1981	1983	1985	1987	1989
All women:					
Total (in thousands).....					
7,094	8,387	8,690	8,808	9,415	9,955
Percent awarded\1\.....					
59.1	59.2	57.7	61.3	59.0	57.7
Percent actually received payment.....					
34.6	34.6	34.9	36.8	39.0	37.4
Percent received full payment.....					
23.6	22.5	23.2	24.0	26.3	25.6
Women above poverty level:					
Total (in thousands).....					
5,121	5,821	5,792	6,011	6,224	6,749
Percent awarded\1\.....					
67.3	67.9	65.3	71.0	66.5	64.6
Percent actually received payment.....					
41.1	41.4	42.6	44.1	44.8	43.1
Women below poverty level:					
Total (in thousands).....					
1,973	2,566	2,898	2,797	3,191	3,206
Percent awarded\1\.....					
38.1	39.7	42.5	40.4	44.3	43.3
Percent actually received payment.....					
17.8	19.3	19.6	21.3	27.7	25.4
Aggregate payment (in billions of dollars):\2\					
Child support due.....					
12.6	13.7	12.5	12.6	15.9	16.3
Child support received.....					

8.1	8.4	8.8	8.3	10.9	11.2
Aggregate child support deficit.....					
4.5	5.3	3.7	4.3	5.0	5.1

\1\Award status as of spring 1979, 1982, 1984, 1986, 1988, and 1990.

\2\In 1989 dollars.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 173 Child Support and Alimony: 1989, Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office.

Approximately 5.7 million women with children under age 21 (58 percent) had been awarded child support or had an agreement to receive child support payments, but only 5.0 million (50 percent) of the women were actually ``supposed to receive'' child support in 1989. The rights of the remaining 8 percent were no longer in force because the father who owed payments had died, the children had grown past the age of eligibility for payments, or because of another reason.

Many of the women who were awarded child support payments did not receive the full amount they were due. In 1989, about half (51 percent) of the 5.0 million women owed child support payments received the full amount, about 24 percent of the women received less than they were owed, and 25 percent received no payment at all. Table 11-5 shows that average amount of child support for women who received payments in 1989 was \$2,995, about 19 percent of their average total income. In 1978, the average amount of child support was \$1,800, about 20

percent of the woman's income.

TABLE 11-5.--CHILD SUPPORT PAYMENTS AWARDED AND RECEIVED  
IN 1989--WOMEN WITH CHILDREN PRESENT, BY SELECTED

CHARACTERISTICS

[Women with own children under 21 years of age  
present from an absent father as of spring 1990]

-----  
-----

Supposed to receive child support in

1989

Percent -----

awarded		Actually received support
	Characteristics of women	Total
child		in 1989
		(thousands)

support      Total      -----

payments\1\      (thousands)      Mean

Percent      child      Mean

support      income

-----  
-----

ALL WOMEN

	Total.....				9,955
57.7	4,953	75.2	\$2,995	\$16,171	

Current Marital Status

Married\2\.....					2,531
79.0	1,685	72.1	2,931	14,469	
Divorced.....					3,056
76.8	2,123	77.0	3,322	19,456	

Separated.....					1,352
47.9	527	79.7	3,060	14,891	
Widowed\3\.....					65
(B)	34	(B)	(B)	(B)	
Never married.....					2,950
23.9	583	73.2	1,888	9,495	

#### Race and Spanish Origin

White.....					6,905
67.5	4,048	76.5	3,132	16,632	
Black.....					2,770
34.5	791	69.7	2,263	13,898	
Spanish origin\4\.....					1,112
40.6	364	69.8	2,965	14,758	

#### Years of School Completed

Less than 12 years.....					2,372
36.9	741	66.7	1,754	8,201	
High school: 4 years.....					4,704
62.0	2,470	76.4	2,698	13,535	
College:					
1 to 3 years.....					1,988
65.0	1,139	76.6	3,338	18,462	
4 years or more.....					891
74.5	603	77.9	4,850	30,872	

#### WOMEN BELOW POVERTY

Total.....					3,206
43.3	1,190	68.3	1,889	5,047	

#### Current Marital Status

Married\2\.....					176
72.2	106	67.0	2,275	4,351	
Divorced.....					820
70.4	525	66.3	2,112	5,581	
Separated.....					612
47.1	221	74.2	1,717	4,917	

Widowed.....					8
(B)	4	(B)	(B)	(B)	
Never Married\3\.....					1,590
24.5	334	68.6	1,553	4,543	

#### Race

White.....					1,763
54.6	827	67.8	1,972	5,010	
Black.....					1,314
29.2	325	69.8	1,674	5,174	
Spanish origin\4\.....					536
33.0	148	63.5	1,824	4,958	

-----

\1\Award status as of spring 1989.

\2\Remarried women whose previous marriage ended in divorce.

\3\Widowed women whose previous marriage ended in divorce.

\4\Persons of Spanish origin may be of any race.

Note.--B base less than 75,000.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. Series P-23, No. 173, Child Support and Alimony: 1989.

Of the 10 million women with children by a noncustodial father, 25 percent were remarried, 45 percent were divorced or separated, and 30 percent were never married. About 32 percent had incomes below the poverty level. Of these poor women, only 43 percent had agreements to receive child support and were due payments in 1989. Another 6 percent had agreements but were not due payments in 1989 (see table 11-5). Of the poor mothers who were supposed to receive child support payments in 1989, 68 percent (813,000) actually received payments, while 32

percent  
did not.

For women who actually received child support payments in 1989, the amount of payment tended to be higher than average for divorced women, white women, and women who had gone to college for at least a year. Those with lower than average payment amounts included never-married women, black women, and women who had not completed 12 years of school (see table 11-5).

Only 24 percent of women who had never married were awarded child support payments; compared with 77 percent of divorced women, 79 percent of remarried women and 48 percent of women who were separated. Moreover, among the 5.0 million women who were supposed to receive child support, the percentages of those who actually received payments were: 73 percent of never-married mothers, 72 percent of remarried mothers, 80 percent of separated mothers, and 77 percent of divorced mothers.

Of the 3.7 million women who actually received child support payments in 1989, 44 percent were divorced, 33 percent were remarried, 11 percent were separated, and 11 percent were single (never married). The women who had never married received, on the average, the lowest amount of child support payments. Among women who were poor despite having been awarded child support, the percentages differed. Of the 813,000 poor women who received child support payments in 1989, 43 percent

were divorced, 9 percent were remarried, 20 percent were separated, and 28 percent were never married.

Black mothers and mothers of Spanish origin living apart from the father of their children were much less likely than their white counterparts to be awarded child support. Almost 68 percent of white mothers were awarded child support payments, compared with 35 percent of black mothers, and 41 percent of mothers of Spanish origin. Further, both black and Spanish-origin mothers received smaller payments, on the average, than did white mothers.

Mothers who were not high school graduates were less likely than the average to be awarded child support, and their support payments were on the average much smaller than those of mothers who had completed more than 12 years of school.

In addition, the age of the woman was related to the awarding of child support payments. Women aged 30 to 39 were the most likely to be awarded child support. Women 40 years of age and older were the most likely to actually receive payments and they received, on average, higher support payments. Women under age 30 were the least likely to be awarded payments, and those who were awarded support received smaller payments, on average, than older women.

Another factor related to child support was the number of children the mother had with her in the absence of their father. Women with two children were the most likely to

receive  
support.

#### SERVICES FOR AFDC AND NON-AFDC CASES

Each State's child support plan must provide that the child support agency will undertake to secure support for an AFDC child whose rights to support have been assigned to the State.

This includes nearly all AFDC children, since assignment of rights to support is a condition of eligibility for AFDC benefits. The State must also provide in its plan that it will

undertake to establish the paternity of an AFDC child who is

born out of wedlock. These requirements apply in all cases except where, in accordance with standards established by the

Secretary, the State finds that to apply them would be against

the best interests of the child. For families whose AFDC eligibility ends due to the receipt of (or an increase in) child support, States must continue to provide child support

enforcement services, without imposing the application fee. This policy was established by Public Law 98-378, the Child Support Enforcement Amendments of 1984.

With respect to non-AFDC families, the law provides that

the State must make available, once an application is filed with the State agency, the child support collection and paternity determination services which are provided under the

plan for AFDC families. The State must charge non-AFDC families

an application fee of up to \$25. The amount of the maximum allowable fee may be adjusted periodically by the Secretary of

the Department of Health and Human Services to reflect changes



in administrative costs. States may charge the fee against the custodial parent, pay the fee out of State funds, or recover it from the noncustodial parent.

States also have the option of charging a late payment fee equal to between 3 and 6 percent of the amount of overdue support. Late payment fees may be charged to the noncustodial parents of AFDC and non-AFDC families and are to be collected only after the full amount of the support has been paid to the child. In addition, a State may at its option recover costs in excess of the application fee. Such recovery may be from either the custodial parent or the noncustodial parent. If a State chooses to make recovery from the custodial parent, it must have in effect a procedure whereby all persons in the State who have authority to order support are informed that such costs are to be collected from the custodial parent.

Finally, child support enforcement services must include the enforcement of spousal support, but only if a support obligation has been established with respect to the spouse; the child and spouse are living in the same household; and child support is being collected along with spousal support.

#### THE FEDERAL ROLE

The Federal statute provides that the child support program must be administered by a separate organizational unit under the control of a person designated by and reporting

directly to  
the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS). Under the  
present organizational structure of the Department, this  
office  
is known as the Federal Office of Child Support Enforcement  
(OCSE). The Family Support Act of 1988 requires the  
appointment  
of an Assistant Secretary for Family Support within HHS to  
administer a number of programs, including the Child  
Support  
Enforcement program under title IV-D of the Act. Currently,  
this is the Assistant Secretary for the Administration for  
Children and Families.

A primary responsibility of the director is to  
establish  
such standards for State programs for locating absent  
parents,  
establishing paternity, and obtaining child support and  
support  
for the spouse (or former spouse) with whom the absent  
parent's  
child is living as he determines to be necessary to assure  
that  
the programs will be effective. In addition to this broad  
statutory mandate, the director is required to establish  
minimum organizational and staffing requirements for State  
child support agencies, and to review and approve State  
plans.

The statute also requires the director of the OCSE to  
provide technical assistance to the States to help them  
establish effective systems for collecting child and  
spousal  
support and establishing paternity. To fulfill this  
requirement, the OCSE operates a National Child Support  
Enforcement Reference Center as a central location for the  
collection and dissemination of information about State and  
local programs. OCSE also provides, under a contract with  
the  
American Bar Association Child Support Project, training  
and  
information dissemination on legal issues to persons

working in  
the field of child support enforcement. Special  
initiatives,  
such as a recent effort to assist major urban areas in  
improving program performance, have also been undertaken by  
the  
OCSE.

The Child Support Enforcement Amendments of 1984  
(Public  
Law 98-378) extend the research and demonstration authority  
in  
section 1115 of the Social Security Act to the child  
support  
enforcement program. This will make it possible for States  
to  
test innovative approaches to support enforcement so long  
as  
the modification does not disadvantage children in need of  
support nor result in an increase in Federal AFDC costs.  
Public  
Law 98-378 also authorizes special project grants to  
promote  
improvement in interstate enforcement. The authorization is  
\$15  
million for each fiscal year after 1986.

The director of the OCSE has full responsibility for  
program evaluation. Audits are required at least every 3  
years  
to determine whether the standards and requirements  
prescribed  
by law and regulations have been met. Under the penalty  
provision, a State's AFDC matching funds must be reduced by  
an  
amount equal to at least 1 but no more than 2 percent for  
the  
first failure to comply substantially with the standards  
and  
requirements, at least 2 but no more than 3 percent for the  
second failure, and at least 3 but no more than 5 percent  
for  
the third and subsequent failures.

## FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT TOOLS

The statute creates several Federal mechanisms to assist the States in performing their paternity and child support enforcement functions. These include use of the Internal Revenue Service, the Federal courts, and the Federal Parent Locator Service (FPLS).

The statute requires the Secretary of HHS, upon the request of a State, to certify to the Secretary of Treasury for collection by the IRS any amounts identified by the State as representing delinquent child support payments. The Secretary may certify only the amounts delinquent under a court or administrative order, and only upon a showing by the State that it has made diligent and reasonable efforts to collect amounts due using its own collection mechanisms. States must reimburse the Federal Government for any costs involved in making the collections. Collections may be made on behalf of both AFDC and non-AFDC families. Use by the States of this regular IRS collection mechanism (which may include seizure by the IRS of property, freezing of accounts, and other procedures) has been relatively infrequent. Using IRS collection methods, in fiscal year 1993, collections were made in only 329 cases nationwide, for a total collection of \$155,677.

The availability of the IRS collection mechanism for child support was amplified in amendments enacted as part of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981 (Public Law 97-35) to

allow the collection of past due support from Federal tax refunds upon a simple showing by the State agency that an individual owes at least \$150 in past-due support which has been assigned to the State as a condition of AFDC eligibility.

Upon receiving this showing, the Secretary of Treasury is required to withhold from any tax refunds due that individual

an amount equal to any past-due support. The withheld amount is

sent to the State agency, together with notice of the taxpayer's current address.

Public Law 98-378 created a similar IRS offset program for non-AFDC families owed child support. States must submit to the

IRS for withholding, the names of absent parents who have arrearages of at least \$500 and who, on the basis of current

payment patterns and the enforcement efforts that have been made, are unlikely to pay the arrearage before the IRS offset

can occur. The law establishes specific notice requirements and

mandates that the absent parent and any spouse be informed of

the procedures which may be taken to protect the unobligated

spouse's portion of the refund. The 1988 provision applied to

refunds payable after December 31, 1985, and before January 1,

1991. Public Law 101-508 makes permanent the IRS offset program

for non-AFDC families.

In fiscal year 1993, a total of 925,264 cases were offset,

which resulted in child support collections of \$609 million.

States also may have access to the Federal courts to enforce court orders for support. The director of the

Office of

Child Support Enforcement must approve a State's application

for permission to use the courts of the United States to enforce court orders for support upon a finding that: (1) another State has not undertaken to enforce the court order of

the originating State against an absent parent within a reasonable time; and (2) that use of the Federal courts is the

only reasonable method of enforcing such order. This mechanism,

designed to assist the States in enforcing interstate cases,

has gone unused, apparently because the States view it as costly and complex.

Finally, the statute also requires the establishment of a

Federal Parent Locator Service to be used to find absent parents in order to secure and enforce child support obligations. Upon request, the Secretary of HHS must provide to

an authorized person the most recent address and place of employment of any absent parent if the information is contained

in the records of the Department of Health and Human Services,

or can be obtained from any other department or agency of the

United States or of any State. The Secretary must also make available the services of the FPLS to any State that wishes to

locate an absent parent or child for the purpose of enforcing

any Federal or State law with respect to the unlawful taking or

restraint of a child, or making or enforcing a child custody

determination.

#### THE STATE ROLE

Each State is required to designate a single and separate organizational unit of State government to administer the program. Earlier child support legislation, enacted in 1967, had required that the program be administered by the welfare agency. The 1975 act deleted this requirement in order to give each State the opportunity to select the most effective administrative mechanism. Most States have placed the child support agency within the social or human services umbrella agency which also administers the AFDC program. However, two States have placed the agency in the department of revenue and two States have placed the agency in the office of the attorney general. The law allows the programs to be administered either on the State or local level. Ten programs are locally administered. A few programs are State administered in some counties and locally administered in others.

States must have plans, approved by the director of the OCSE, which set forth their functions and responsibilities. Both AFDC and non-AFDC families must be served. States must also enter into cooperative arrangements with appropriate courts and law enforcement officials to assist the child support agency in administering the program. These agreements may include provision for reimbursing courts and law enforcement officials for their assistance. States must operate a parent locator service to locate absent parents, and they must maintain full records of collections and disbursements, and otherwise maintain an adequate reporting system.

In order to facilitate the collection of support in interstate cases, a State must cooperate with other States in

establishing paternity, locating absent parents, and in securing compliance with an order issued by another State.

The law requires the States to use several enforcement tools. They must use the IRS tax refund offset procedure for AFDC and non-AFDC families, and they must also determine periodically whether any individuals receiving unemployment compensation owe child support obligations. The State employment security agency is required to withhold unemployment benefits, and to pay the child support agency any outstanding child support obligations established by an agreement with the individual or through legal processes.

Public Law 98-378 mandated that States use a number of other enforcement techniques. These include: (1) imposing liens against real and personal property for amounts of overdue support; (2) withholding of State tax refunds payable to a parent who is delinquent in support payments; (3) making available information regarding the amount of overdue support owed to a consumer credit bureau upon a request; (4) requiring individuals who have demonstrated a pattern of delinquent payments to post a bond or give some other guarantee to secure payment of overdue support; (5) establishing expedited processes within the State judicial system or under administrative processes for obtaining and enforcing child support orders, and, at the option of the State, determining paternity; (6) notifying each AFDC recipient at least once each year of the amount of child support collected on behalf of that recipient; (7) permitting the establishment of paternity until a child's 18th birthday; and (8) at the option of the State,



providing for cases not enforced by the State CSE agency, that child support payments must be made through the agency that administers the State's income withholding system if either the custodial or noncustodial parent requests that they be made in this manner.

State child support agencies are required to undertake child support collections on behalf of children receiving foster care maintenance payments under title IV-E of the Social Security Act, if an assignment of rights to support has been secured by the foster care agency. In addition, foster care agencies are required to take steps, where appropriate, to secure an assignment to the State of any rights to support on behalf of a child receiving foster care maintenance payments.

State agencies are also required, as a result of Public Law 98-378, to petition to include medical support as part of any child support order whenever health care coverage is available to the noncustodial parent at a reasonable cost. And, if a family loses AFDC eligibility as the result of increased collection of support payments, the State must continue to provide Medicaid benefits for 4 calendar months beginning with the month of ineligibility. States also must provide services to medically needy (Medicaid only) families referred to the State IV-D agency from the State Medicaid agency.

Finally, the statute requires each State to comply with any other requirements and standards that the Secretary determines to be necessary to the establishment of an effective child support program.

## PATERNITY ESTABLISHMENT

Paternity establishment is a prerequisite for obtaining a child support order. In 1990, 28 percent of children born in the U.S. were born to unmarried women. According to the OCSE, paternity is established in less than one-third of these cases.

Without paternity established, these children have no legal claim on their fathers' income. A major weakness of the CSE program is its poor performance in securing paternity for such

children. In addition to financial benefits, establishing paternity can provide social, psychological, and emotional benefits and in some cases the father's medical history may be

needed to give a child proper care.

In 1991, 35 percent of the 14.6 million children living solely with their mothers had a mother who had never married.

Inasmuch as the percentage of children born to parents that are

not married has been increasing during the last two decades,

paternity establishment has become one of the more crucial elements of the CSE program.

In the 1980s legislation was enacted that contained provisions aimed at increasing the number of paternities established. P.L. 98-378, the Child Support Enforcement Amendments of 1984, required States to implement laws that permitted paternity to be established until a child's 18th birthday. P.L. 100-485, the Family Support Act of 1988 stipulated the following.

States are required to meet Federal standards for the

establishment of paternity.

States are required to have all parties in a contested paternity case take a genetic test upon

the

request of any party, and are permitted to charge

non-

AFDC individuals for the costs of the paternity

test.

States are encouraged to adopt simple civil  
processes

for voluntarily acknowledging paternity and civil  
procedures for establishing paternity in contested  
cases.

States are reimbursed at a 90-percent Federal  
matching rate for laboratory testing to establish  
paternity.

Each State is required, in administering any law  
involving the issuance of birth certificates, to  
require each parent to furnish his or her SSN,  
unless

the State finds good cause for not doing so.

Retroactive to 1984, any child for whom a  
paternity

action was brought but whose suit was dismissed  
because

of statute of limitations less than 18 years must  
be

allowed to bring a new suit.

A 1992 OCSE report on paternity establishment says that  
paternity establishment has improved because of Federal  
requirements, improved genetic testing, and innovative  
State

and local programs. Many States now have procedures through  
which a man may legally admit paternity (by signing a  
document

that legally establishes paternity) without court  
involvement.

Many States contend that voluntary acknowledgement of  
paternity

procedures save money and require less time than paternity  
establishment procedures that involve the courts. While the  
number of paternities established through CSE reached a  
record

high in 1991, huge disparities exist among States.

OBRA 93 required States to have in effect by October 1, 1993, the following paternity establishment procedures:

(1) for a simple civil process for voluntarily acknowledging paternity under which the State must explain the rights and responsibilities of acknowledging paternity and afford due process safeguards. Procedures must include a hospital-based

program for the voluntary acknowledgment of paternity

during the period immediately preceding or following the birth of a child;

(2) under which the voluntary acknowledgment of paternity creates a rebuttable, or at the option of the

State, conclusive presumption of paternity, and

under which such voluntary acknowledgments are admissible as evidence of paternity;

(3) under which the voluntary acknowledgment of paternity must be recognized as a basis for seeking a

support order without first requiring any further proceedings to establish paternity;

(4) which provide that any objection to genetic testing results must be made in writing within a specified number of days prior to any hearing at which

such results may be introduced in evidence, and if

no objection is made the test results are admissible as

evidence of paternity without the need for foundation

testimony or other proof of authenticity or accuracy;

(5) which create a rebuttable or, at the option of

the State, conclusive presumption of paternity upon

genetic testing results indicating a threshold probability of the alleged father being the father of

the child;

(6) which require default orders in paternity cases

upon a showing that process has been served on the defendant and whatever additional showing may be required by State law; and

(7) which require States to have expedited processes

for paternity establishment in contested cases and to

require that a State give full faith and credit to determinations of paternity made by other States.

A 1993 Urban Institute report\1\ analyzes national survey data that was obtained to provide a better understanding of how paternity establishment is handled by CSE agencies in counties throughout the U.S. The study found:

-----  
-----  
\1\Washington, D.C. The Urban Institute. ``Promising Approaches to Improving Paternity Establishment Rates at the Local Level,`` Sonenstein, Freya L., Pamela A. Holcomb and Kristen S. Seefeldt. Feb. 1993.

-----  
-----  
At the local level paternity establishment is usually located in one of three settings: a legal agency like a prosecuting attorney's office or court, a non-legal agency like the human services department responsible

for welfare, or a shared situation in which cases  
with cooperative fathers are handled by the human  
service agency and contested cases are transferred to a  
legal agency [35 percent of the counties transferred  
contested cases from the non-legal agency to the  
legal agency].

Counties generally use one of four approaches to  
establish  
paternity:

A no-consent process wherein all paternity cases  
are handled through the court and there are no  
opportunities to consent voluntarily outside a  
court hearing; a one-time consent process: alleged  
fathers are given one opportunity to consent voluntarily,  
usually right after notification of the allegation;  
a multi-consent process: alleged fathers are given at  
least two opportunities to consent, usually after  
notification and also after genetic testing; and a  
court-as-last-resort process: alleged fathers have  
to respond to a notification by filing with the court  
their intention to consent to or contest the  
allegation. The court's role after the initial  
notification is generally limited to handing  
contested cases after genetic tests. Multiple opportunities  
for consent are available. [The most common approach,  
used by 37 percent of the counties, was the multi-  
consent approach].

The report found that counties with the highest rate of paternity determinations offer multiple opportunities for voluntary consent and have adopted an organizational approach in which cooperative fathers are handled by the welfare agency and contested cases are transferred to a legal agency. The 27 counties that used these combined approaches show an average paternity rate of 65 percent when other factors are held constant. Given that it is unrealistic that other factors can be held constant (compared to rates between 22 and 45 percent in counties where other approaches were used). The report cautions readers that the findings from the analysis are merely suggestive of possible avenues to follow in seeking improvements in paternity establishment.

#### ENFORCEMENT OF MEDICAL SUPPORT

Health care for children can be a major expense for the custodial parent, and can be a burden for the State if public assistance is being provided to the children. Public Law 95-142, the Medicare-Medicaid Anti-Fraud and Abuse Amendments of 1977 (Section 1912 of the Social Security Act), permits State Medicaid agencies to use the CSE agency to assist in the enforcement of medical support rights due from or through a noncustodial parent, since it was not intended that the Medicaid agency establish a separate system for the enforcement of medical support obligations. On February 11, 1980, the OCSE and the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA)

published  
joint regulations to implement section 1912 of the act  
through  
optional cooperative agreements between the State Medicaid  
agency and the State CSE agency. Under these agreements the  
Medicaid agency reimburses the CSE agency for medical  
support  
enforcement activities performed pursuant to the agreement.  
In  
35 jurisdictions the Federal Medicaid reimbursement rate is  
lower than the 66 percent matching rate for CSE activities  
(based on fiscal year 1993 rates), and nationwide it  
averages  
about 56 percent.

Section 16 of Public Law 98-378 requires the Secretary  
of  
the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) to issue  
regulations to require that State CSE agencies petition for  
the  
inclusion of medical support as part of any child support  
order  
whenever health care coverage is available to the  
noncustodial  
parent at reasonable cost. According to the Federal  
regulations, any employment-related or other group coverage  
is  
considered reasonable, under the assumption that health  
insurance is inexpensive to the employee/noncustodial  
parent. A  
1983 study by the National Center for Health Services  
Research  
of the Public Health Service indicated that, for low-wage  
employees with employer-provided insurance coverage, 72  
percent  
of the premium was paid for by the employer.

On October 16, 1985, the OCSE published regulations  
amending previous regulations and implementing section 16  
of  
Public Law 98-378. The regulations stated that the CSE  
agency  
must obtain basic medical support information and provide



this  
information to the State Medicaid agency. Also, if the  
custodial parent does not have satisfactory health  
insurance  
coverage, the CSE agency must petition the court or  
administrative authority to include medical support in new  
or  
modified support orders and inform the State Medicaid  
agency of  
any new or modified support orders that include a medical  
support obligation. The 1985 regulations also required the  
CSE  
agency to take steps to enforce medical support that has  
been  
ordered by a court or administrative process under State  
law.  
In addition, these regulations permit the use of CSE  
matching  
funds at the 66 percent rate for required medical support  
activities. Before these regulations were issued, medical  
support activities were pursued by CSE agencies only under  
optional cooperative agreements with Medicaid agencies.  
Some of  
the functions that the CSE agency may perform under a  
cooperative agreement with the Medicaid agency include:  
receiving referrals from the Medicaid agency, locating  
absent  
parents, establishing paternity, determining whether the  
noncustodial parent has a health insurance policy or plan  
that  
covers the child, obtaining sufficient information about  
the  
health insurance policy or plan to permit the filing of a  
claim  
with the insurer, filing a claim with the insurer or  
transmitting the necessary information to the Medicaid  
agency,  
securing health insurance coverage through court or  
administrative order (when it will not reduce the  
noncustodial  
parent's ability to pay child support), and recovering

amounts

necessary to reimburse medical assistance payments.

A report by the Urban Institute stated that although the practice of including medical coverage provisions in child support orders had increased, the priority and emphasis given such provision was still quite low (as of September 1985). It reported that child support staff were reluctant to go to court just for medical support, and that many judges would not order medical support if it might cause a reduction in cash support payments. The report also said that enforcing medical coverage provisions once they are established is very difficult, and that it requires the agency to monitor continuation of coverage and to act to restore coverage when it lapses.\2\

-----  
-----  
    \2\Nightingale, Demetra Smith, and others. ``The Inclusion of Medical Coverage in Child Support Cases: Current Status and Options for the Future.'' Draft. Washington, Urban Institute, May 1986. p. vi.  
[Hereafter cited as Urban Institute, ``The Inclusion of Medical Coverage in Child Support Cases.'']  
-----  
-----

The Urban Institute study reported that in 1983, 4.6 million children with an absent parent were without public (Medicaid) or private health insurance. This represented 34 percent of all children with an absent parent. Another 4.9 million children with an absent parent were covered solely by

Medicaid. The study estimated that including medical coverage in child support orders in 1984 might have benefited 1,353,000 totally uninsured children (those without Medicaid or private insurance) and perhaps another 300,000 to 466,000 children covered only by Medicaid at that time.\3\

-----

-----

\3\Ibid., p. 24-25.

-----

-----

According to the Census Bureau data on child support and alimony, 40 percent of the 5.7 million women who had a child support award in 1989 received health insurance coverage in their awards. For white women, the figure was 43 percent; for black women, 28 percent; and for women of Hispanic origin, 21 percent. For divorced women, the figure was 44 percent and for women who had never married, the figure was 26 percent.

On September 16, 1988, the OCSE issued regulations amending the medical support enforcement provisions. These regulations require the CSE agency to develop criteria to identify existing child support cases that have a high potential for obtaining medical support, and to petition the court or administrative authority to modify support orders to include medical support for targeted cases even if no other modification is anticipated. In addition, the CSE agency is required to provide

the custodial parent with information regarding the health insurance coverage obtained by the noncustodial parent for the

dependent child or children. Moreover, the 1988 regulation deletes the condition that CSE agencies may secure health insurance coverage under a cooperative agreement only when it

will not reduce the noncustodial parent's ability to pay child

support. The purpose of the medical support provisions is to

expand the number of children for whom private health insurance

coverage is obtained by increasing the availability of third-

party resources to pay for medical care and thereby result in

Medicaid cost savings to the States and the Federal Government.

The Urban Institute report, however, concluded that while there

is no doubt that many children could benefit from inclusion of

medical insurance, especially those who currently have no public or private health care coverage, Medicaid savings would

be relatively modest compared to total annual Medicaid costs.\4\

-----  
-----  
    \4\Urban Institute, ``The Inclusion of Medical Coverage  
in Child  
Support Cases,'' p. vi.

-----  
-----  
    According to OCSE data, 53 percent of support orders  
established in fiscal year 1993 included health insurance,  
whereas only 30 percent of support orders that were  
enforced or  
modified in fiscal year 1993 included health insurance.

OBRA 93 included the following health insurance support provisions:

(1) prohibit an insurer from denying enrollment of a child under the health insurance coverage of the child's parent on the grounds that the child was born out of wedlock, is not claimed as a dependent on the parent's Federal income tax return, or does not reside with the parent or in the insurer's service area;

(2) require an insurer and an employer doing business in the State, in any case in which a parent is required by court or administrative order to provide health coverage for a child and the child is otherwise eligible for family health coverage through the insurer, (a) to permit the parent, without regard to any enrollment season restrictions, to enroll such child under such family coverage; (b) if the parent fails to provide health insurance coverage for a child, to enroll the child upon application by the child's other parent or the State child support or Medicaid agency; and (c) with respect to employers, not to disenroll (or eliminate coverage of) the child unless there is satisfactory written evidence that the order is no longer in effect, or the child is or will be enrolled in comparable health coverage through another insurer that will take effect not later than the effective date of the disenrollment;

(3) require an employer doing business in the State, in the case of health insurance coverage offered through employment

and providing coverage for a child pursuant to a court or administrative order, to withhold from the employee's compensation the employee's share of premiums for health insurance, and to pay that share to the insurer. The Secretary

of Health and Human Services may provide by regulation for such

exceptions to this requirement (and other requirements described above that apply to employers) as the Secretary determines necessary to ensure compliance with an order, or with the limits on withholding that are specified in section

303(b) of the Consumer Credit Protection Act;

(4) prohibit an insurer from imposing requirements upon a

State agency, which is acting as an agent or assignee of an individual eligible for medical assistance and covered by the

insurer, that are different from requirements applicable to an

agent or assignee of any other individual;

(5) require an insurer, in the case of a child who has coverage through the insurer of a noncustodial parent, (a) to

provide the custodial parent with the information necessary for

the child to obtain benefits; (b) to permit the custodial parent (or provider, with the custodial parent's approval) to

submit claims for covered services without the approval of the

noncustodial parent; and (c) to make payment on claims directly

to the custodial parent, the provider, or the State agency; and

(6) permit the State Medicaid agency to garnish the wages,

salary, or other employment income of, and to withhold State

tax refunds to, any person who: (a) is required by court or administrative order to provide health insurance coverage

to an individual eligible for Medicaid; (b) has received payment from a third party for the costs of medical services to that individual; and (c) has not reimbursed either the individual or the provider. The amount subject to garnishment or withholding would be the amount required to reimburse the State agency for expenditures for costs of medical services provided under the Medicaid program. However, claims for current or past-due child support shall take priority over any claims for the costs of medical services.

These provisions are effective April 1, 1994, or, if the Secretary determines that State legislation is needed, the State plan shall not be regarded as failing to comply with the requirements of title IV-D because it has not met these additional requirements before the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the close of the first regular session of the State legislature that begins after August 10, 1993. In the case of a State that has a two-year legislative session, each year of such session shall be deemed to be a separate regular session of the State legislature.

TABLE 11-6.--CHILD SUPPORT AWARD STATUS AND INCLUSION OF HEALTH

INSURANCE IN AWARD, BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF WOMEN

[Women 15 years and older with own children under 21 years of age  
present from absent fathers as of spring 1990]

-----

-----

Awarded child

support payments

-----

Health insurance

included in child

Total

support award

Characteristic

(thousands)

Total

-----

(thousands)

Percent

Number of

(thousands) total

awarded

-----

-----

Total.....	9,955	5,748
2,307 40.1		

Current Marital  
Status\1\

Remarried\2\.....	2,531	1,999
755 37.8		

Divorced.....	3,056	2,347
1,038 44.2		

Separated.....	1,352	648
298 46.0		

Never married.....	2,950	704
186 26.4		

Race and Hispanic Origin

White.....	6,905	4,661
1,992 42.7		



Black.....	2,770	955
271        28.4		
Hispanic\3\.....	1,112	452
96        21.2		

#### Age

15 to 17 years.....	128	
23        .....        .....		
18 to 29 years.....	3,086	1,408
572        40.6		
30 to 39 years.....	4,175	2,685
1,097        40.9		
40 years and over.....	2,566	1,632
638        39.1		

#### Years of School Completed

Less than 12 years.....	2,372	875
233        26.6		
High school: 4 years....	4,704	2,916
1,218        41.8		
College:		
1 to 3 years.....	1,988	1,293
575        44.5		
4 years or more.....	891	664
281        42.3		

#### Number of Own Children Present from an Absent Father

One child.....	5,721	3,274
1,316        40.2		
Two children.....	2,873	1,812
739        40.8		
Three children.....	1,030	537
220        41.0		
Four children or more...	331	125
33        26.4		

-----  
-----  
\1\Excludes a small number of current widowed women whose previous

marriage ended in divorce.

\2\Remarried women whose previous marriage ended in divorce.

\3\Persons of Hispanic origin may be of any race.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports. Child

Support and Alimony: 1989 (Supplemental Report). Series P-60, No. 173,

September 1991. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1991. p.

11.

#### WAGE WITHHOLDING

The Family Support Act required immediate income withholding to begin in November 1990 for all new or modified

orders being enforced by the State's CSE agency. As of January

1, 1994, States were required to provide for immediate wage withholding for all support orders initially issued on or after

that date, regardless of whether a parent has applied for CSE

services. Immediate income withholding has been enacted by about half of the States.

Public Law 98-378 required that States have in effect two

distinct procedures for withholding wages of noncustodial parents. First, for cases enforced through the CSE agency, States were required to use a procedure that imposed wage withholding in child support cases whenever an arrearage accrued that was equal to the amount of support payable for 1

month. Second, for all child support cases, all new or modified

support orders issued in the State were required to include a provision for wage withholding when an arrearage occurs. The intent of the second procedure was to ensure that orders not enforced through the CSE agency contain the authority necessary to permit wage withholding to be initiated by someone other than the CSE agency. The Family Support Act of 1988 (P.L. 100-485) extended the use of mandatory wage withholding to nondelinquent support. In fiscal year 1993, 53 percent of total collections or about \$4.7 billion were made through wage withholding.

According to the Federal statute, State due-process requirements govern the scope of notice to provide to an obligor (i.e., noncustodial parent) when withholding is triggered. As a general rule, the noncustodial parent is entitled to advance notice of the withholding procedure. This notice, where required, must inform the noncustodial parent of the following: the amount that will be withheld; the application of withholding to any current or subsequent period of employment; the procedures available for contesting the withholding and the sole basis for objection (i.e., mistake of fact); the period allotted the noncustodial parent to contact the State to contest the withholding and the result of failure to contact the State within this timeframe (i.e., issuance of notification to the employer to begin withholding); the steps the State will take if the noncustodial parent contests the withholding including the procedure to resolve such contests.

If the noncustodial parent contests the income withholding notice, the State must conduct a hearing, determine if the withholding is valid, notify the noncustodial parent of the decision, and notify the employer to commence the deductions if withholding is upheld. All of this must occur within 45 days of the initial notice of withholding. Whether a State uses a judicial or an administrative process, the only basis for a hearing is a factual mistake about the amount owed (current and/or arrearage) or the identity of the noncustodial parent.

When withholding is uncontested or when a contested case is resolved in favor of the withholding, the administering agency must serve a withholding notice on the employer. The employer is required to withhold as much of the noncustodial parent's wages as is necessary to comply with the order. This will include the current support amount plus an amount to be applied toward liquidation of any arrearage. In addition, the employer may retain a fee to offset the administrative cost of implementing withholding.

The Federal Consumer Credit Protection Act (FCCPA) determines the maximum portion of an individual's total disposable earnings that is subject to garnishment. The FCCPA limits apply when enforcing an order for support. These limits are 50 percent of disposable earnings for a noncustodial parent who is the head of a household, and 60 percent for a noncustodial parent who is not supporting a second family. These percentages increase by 5 percentage points, to 55 and 65 percent, respectively, when the arrearages represent

support

that was due more than 12 weeks before the current pay period.

Upon receiving the notice, the employer must begin withholding the appropriate amount of the obligor's wages no

later than the first pay period that occurs after 14 days following the date the notice was mailed. The 1984 amendments

regulate the language in State statutes on the other rights and

liabilities of the employer. For instance, the employer is subject to a fine for discharging a noncustodial parent or taking other forms of retaliation as a result of a withholding

order. In addition, the employer is held liable for amounts not withheld as directed.

In addition to being able to charge the noncustodial parent

a fee for the administrative costs associated with wage withholding, the employer can combine all support payments required to be withheld for multiple obligors into a single payment and forward it to the CSE agency or court with a list

of the cases to which the payments apply. The employer need not

vary from his normal pay and disbursement cycle to comply with

withholding orders; however, support payments must be forwarded

to the State or other designated agency within 10 days of the

date on which the noncustodial parent is paid.

When the noncustodial parent changes jobs, the previous employer must notify the court or agency that entered the withholding order and provide specified information. The State

must notify the new employer or income source to begin withholding from the obligor's wages.

In addition, States must develop procedures to

terminate

income withholding orders, for example, when all of the children are emancipated and no arrearage exists.

## PROPERTY LIENS

The use of liens for child support enforcement was characterized during congressional debate on Public Law 98-378 as ``simple to execute and cost effective and a catalyst for an absent parent to pay past due support in order to clear title to the property in question.'' (H. Rept. 527, 98th Cong., 1st sess., 1983) The report said that liens would complement the income withholding provisions of the 1984 law and be particularly helpful in enforcing support payments owed by noncustodial parents with substantial assets or income but who are not salaried employees.

Public Law 98-378 required States to enact laws and implement ``procedures under which liens are imposed against real property for amount of overdue support owed by an absent parent who resides or owns property in the State.'' This can apply to such things as land, vehicles, houses, antique furniture, livestock, etc. The law provides, however, that States need not use liens in cases where, on the basis of guidelines that generally are available to the public, it determines that lien procedures would be inappropriate. This provision implicitly requires States to develop guidelines about use of liens.

Generally, a lien for delinquent child support is a statutorily created mechanism by which an obligee (i.e., custodial parent) obtains a nonpossessory interest in property

belonging to the noncustodial parent. The interest of the custodial parent is a slumbering interest that allows the noncustodial parent to retain possession of the property, but affects the noncustodial parent's ability to transfer ownership of the property to anyone else. A child support lien converts the custodial parent from an unsecured to a secured creditor. As such, it gives the custodial parent priority over unsecured creditors and subsequent secured creditors. In some States a lien is established automatically upon entry of a support order and the first incidence of noncompliance by the obligor. Frequently, the mere imposition of a lien will motivate the delinquent parent to do whatever is necessary to remove the lien (i.e., pay past due support). When this is not the case, it may become necessary to enforce the lien. Liens are not self-executory. They merely impede the debtor's ability to transfer property. If a lien exists, a debtor must satisfy the judgment before the property may be sold or transferred. However, it is not necessary for the obligee to wait until the obligor tries to transfer the property before taking action. The obligee may enforce his judgment by execution and levy against the property if he believes that the amount of equity in the property justifies execution.

Several States have increased their use of liens by identifying individuals who possess appropriate assets through use of information obtained from Project 1099. Project 1099 is a cooperative effort involving State CSE agencies, the OCSE,

and the IRS. It is named after the IRS form on which both earned and unearned income is reported. (Examples of reported earned and unearned incomes include: interest paid on savings accounts, stocks and bonds, and distribution of dividends and capital gains; rent or royalty payments; prizes, awards, or winnings; fees paid directors or subcontractors; and unemployment compensation.) Project 1099 was initiated in 1984 to assist in location efforts. Since fall 1988, Project 1099 routinely provides wage and employer information as well as location and asset information on noncustodial parents.

#### CREDIT BUREAU REPORTING

Public Law 98-378 requires that States establish procedures for reporting overdue child support obligations exceeding \$1,000 to consumer reporting agencies (generally referred to as credit bureaus), if such information is requested by the credit bureau. States have the option of using such procedures in cases where the noncustodial parent is less than \$1,000 in arrears. (Moreover, as in the case of liens, this collection procedure need not be used in cases found inappropriate under State guidelines.) The 1984 law requires States to provide the noncustodial parent an advance notice of its intent to release information regarding his child support arrearage and an opportunity for him to contest the accuracy of the information. The CSE agency may charge the credit bureau a fee for the information.

Although some States and counties had agreements in



place  
with credit bureaus to obtain information about the  
location of  
absent parents, the 1984 provision authorizes the routine  
transfer of information concerning overdue child support to  
credit bureaus on a much broader basis. Moreover, it is in  
the  
interest of credit bureaus to request such information  
because  
overdue child support adversely affects an obligated  
parent's  
ability to pay other debts.

Public Law 102-537, the Ted Weiss Child Support  
Enforcement  
Act of 1992, amends the Fair Credit Reporting Act to  
require  
consumer credit reporting agencies to include in any  
consumer  
report information on child support delinquencies provided  
by  
or verified by State or local CSE agencies, which antedates  
the  
report by 7 years.

#### FEDERAL GARNISHMENT

The 1975 CSE legislation included a provision allowing  
garnishment of wages and other payments by the Federal  
Government for enforcement of child support and alimony  
obligations. The 1975 law provides that moneys (the  
entitlement  
to which is based upon remuneration for employment) payable  
by  
the United States to any individual are subject to legal  
proceedings brought for the enforcement against such  
individual  
of his legal obligation to provide child support or make  
alimony payments. The law sets forth in detail the  
procedures  
that must be followed for service of legal process and  
specifies that the term ``based upon remuneration for

employment'' includes wages, periodic benefits for the payment of pensions, retirement or retired pay (included social security and other retirement benefits), and other kinds of Federal payments. The following Federal income sources may not be garnished: any payment as compensation for death under any Federal program, Federal black lung benefits, veterans' pensions or compensation benefits for a service-related disability or death, and amounts paid to defray employment-related expenses.

#### MILITARY ALLOTMENTS

Public Law 97-248, the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982, requires allotments from the pay and allowances of any member of the uniformed service (on active duty) when he fails to make child (or child and spousal) support payments. The requirement arises when the service member fails to make support payments in an amount at least equal to the value of 2 months' worth of support. Provisions of the Federal Consumer Credit Protection Act apply, limiting the percentage of the member's pay that is subject to allotment. The amount of the allotment is the amount of the support payment, as established under a legally enforceable administrative or judicial order.

#### INTERSTATE ENFORCEMENT

State laws require parents to be responsible for the financial support of their children. During the 1930's and

1940's, such laws were used to establish and enforce support obligations when the noncustodial parent, custodial parent, and child lived in the same State. But when noncustodial parents lived out of State, enforcing child support was cumbersome and ineffective. Often the only option in these cases was to seek to extradite the noncustodial parent and, when successful, to jail the person for nonsupport. Extradition is the process used to bring an obligor charged with or convicted of a crime (in this case, criminal nonsupport) from an asylum State back to the State where the children are located. This procedure, rarely used, generally punished the irresponsible parent, but left the abandoned family without financial support.

A University of Michigan study of separated parents nationwide found that 12 percent lived in different States 1 year after divorce or separation. That proportion increased to 25 percent 3 years after, and to 40 percent 8 years after. Estimates based on the Federal income tax refund offset program and other sources suggest that approximately 30 percent of child support cases involve interstate residency of the custodial and noncustodial parents.\5\

-----  
-----  
\\5\Weaver, Ray L., and Robert G. Williams. ``Problems With URESA: Interstate Child Support Enforcement Isn't Working But Could.'' Paper prepared for ABA Third National Child Support Conference, May 10-12,

1989. Washington, American Bar Association 1989, p. 510  
[Hereafter  
cited as Weaver and Williams, ``Problems With URESA'']

-----  
-----

#### Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement of Support Act (URESА)

Since 1950, interstate cooperation has been promoted through the adoption by the States of URESА. This act, which was first proposed by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws in 1950, has been enacted, in substance, in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The act was amended in 1952 and 1958 and revised in 1968.

It is generally maintained that the increasing number of children who received AFDC benefits because of the absence of their father, together with the more frequent instances in which the father lived in another State, led many States to quickly adopt URESА. In 1940, 30.3 percent of AFDC children had an able-bodied father who was living away from the home. By 1950, the figure had reached 49.3 percent. About 32 States had enacted the original version of URESА within 5 years of its promulgation by the National Conference.

The purpose of URESА was to provide a system for the interstate enforcement of support orders without requiring the person seeking support to go (or have her legal representative go) to the State in which the noncustodial parent resided. Where the URESА provisions between the two States are compatible, the law can be used to establish paternity,

locate

an absent parent, and establish, modify, or enforce a support

order. However, some observers note that the use of URESA procedures often result in lower orders for both current support and arrearages. They also contend that few CSE agencies

attempt to use URESA procedures to establish paternity or to

obtain a modification in a support order.

### Long-arm statutes

Unlike URESA, interstate cases established or enforced by

long-arm statutes use the court system in the State of the custodial parent rather than that of the noncustodial parent.

When a person commits certain acts within a State, that person

may be subjecting himself to the jurisdiction of that State,

even if he does not live in that State. The long-arm of the law

of the State where the event happens may reach out to grab the

out-of-State person so that issues relating to the event may be

resolved where it happened. Under the long-arm procedure, the

State must authorize by statute that the acts allegedly committed by the defendant are those that subject the defendant

to the State's jurisdiction. An example is a paternity statute

stating that if conception takes place in the State and the child lives in the State, the State may exercise personal jurisdiction over the alleged father. Long-arm statute language

usually speaks of extending the State's jurisdiction over an

out-of-State defendant to the maximum extent permitted by the U.S. Constitution under the Fourteenth Amendment's Due Process Clause. Long-arm statutes may be used to establish paternity, establish support awards, and enforce support orders.

#### Federal courts

The 1975 CSE law mandated that the State plan for CSE require States to cooperate with other States in establishing paternity, locating absent parents, and securing compliance with court orders and authorized the use of Federal courts as a last resort to enforce an existing order in another State if that State were uncooperative.

Federal law allows the U.S. district courts to be used for the enforcement of child support orders in interstate cases. If another State fails to undertake to enforce a child support order on behalf of the requesting State within a reasonable time, the requesting State may ask the OCSE to certify the case for use of the Federal courts. If the application meets certain procedural requirements and it is determined that use of the Federal courts is the only reasonable method of enforcing an order, the case is to be certified for action by the U.S. district court. (OCSE officials say that Federal courts also can establish support orders.)

Section 460 of the Social Security Act says that the district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction, without regard to any amount in controversy, to hear and

determine any civil action certified by the Secretary of DHHS under section 452(a)(8) of the act. A civil action under section 460 may be brought in any judicial district in which the claim arose, the plaintiff resides, or the defendant resides. Section 452(a)(8) says that the Secretary of DHHS shall receive applications from States for permission to use the courts of the United States to enforce court orders for support against noncustodial parents and, upon a finding that (A) another State has not undertaken to enforce a court order of the originating State against the noncustodial parent within a reasonable time, and (B) that using the Federal courts is the only reasonable method of enforcing such order, approve such applications.

As a condition to obtaining the certification from the Federal OCSE, the CSE agency of the initiating State must give the CSE agency of the responding State at least 60 days after first seeking assistance in enforcing the order, a 30-day warning of its intent to seek enforcement in Federal court. If the initiating State receives no response within the 30-day limit, or if the response is unsatisfactory, the initiating State may apply to the OCSE Regional Office for certification. The application must attest that the above requirements have been satisfied. Upon certification of the case, a civil action may be filed in the U.S. District Court. Although this interstate enforcement procedure has been available since enactment of the CSE program, there has only been one reported

case of its use by a State (the initiating State was California, and the responding State was Texas).

#### Interstate income withholding

Interstate income withholding is a process in which the State of the custodial parent seeks the help of the State in

which the noncustodial parent's income is derived to enforce a

support order using the income withholding mechanism.

Pursuant

to Public Law 98-378, income withholding availability has been

universal for all valid in-State or out-of-State orders issued

or modified after October 1, 1985, and for all orders in CSE

cases regardless of the date the order was issued. Although Federal law requires a State to enforce another State's valid

orders through interstate income withholding, there is no Federal mandate that interstate income withholding procedures

be uniform. Approaches vary from the Model Interstate Income

Withholding Act to URESA registration. The preferred way to handle an interstate income withholding request is to use the

interstate action transmittal form from one CSE agency to another. In CSE cases, Federal regulations required that by August 22, 1988, all interstate income withholding requests be

sent to the enforcing State's central registry for referral to

the appropriate State or local official. The actual wage withholding procedure used by the State in which the noncustodial parent lives is the same as that used in intrastate cases.

States decide whether or not to make interstate income withholding available in non-CSE cases. Some States do not



allow non-CSE interstate income withholding, insisting that all such requests be channeled through the CSE agency. In those States, it is necessary for a private attorney to refer his client to the local CSE office.

1988 law

Public Law 100-485 includes some provisions affecting interstate child support enforcement. The law requires States to establish automated statewide, comprehensive case tracking and monitoring systems, which would improve each State's ability to manage interstate cases. The law also required the establishment of a 15-member commission to study interstate child support establishment and enforcement.

The U.S. Commission on Interstate Child Support's report to Congress includes 120 recommendations for improving the CSE program. The report highlights the following recommendations:

- Establishment of an integrated, automated network linking all the States to provide quick access to locate and income information (which would include

new

- hire information based on W-4 forms);

- Establishment of income withholding across State lines from the person seeking enforcement directly

to

- the income source in the other State;

- Identical enactment by States of the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (which would replace URESA);

- State use of early, voluntary parentage determination

- for child born outside of marriage and uniform evidentiary rules for contested paternity cases;

- Universal access to health care insurance for children of separated parents;

More emphasis on staff training and increased  
resources to ensure that all cases can be processed  
on

a more timely basis; and

Revision of CSE funding to ensure that action is  
taken on cases most in need of attention.\6\

-----  
-----  
    \6\U.S. Commission on Interstate Child Support.  
``Supporting Our  
Children: A Blueprint for Reform.'' 1992. p. xiii.  
-----  
-----

1992 law

Public Law 102-521, the Child Support Recovery Act of  
1992,  
imposes a Federal criminal penalty for the willful failure  
to  
pay a past-due child support obligation with respect to a  
child  
who resides in another State that has remained unpaid for  
longer than a year or is greater than \$5,000. For the first  
conviction the penalty would be a fine of not more than  
\$5,000  
and/or imprisonment for not more than 6 months; for a  
second  
conviction, a fine of up to \$250,000 and/or imprisonment  
for up  
to 2 years.

Other procedures that aid interstate enforcement

In 1948, the National Conference of Commissioners on  
Uniform State Laws and the American Bar Association  
approved  
the Uniform Enforcement of Foreign Judgments Act (UEFJA),  
which  
simplifies the collection of child support arrearages in  
interstate cases. Revised in 1964 and adopted in only 30

States, UEFJA provides that upon the filing of an authenticated foreign (i.e., out-of-State) judgment and notice to the obligor, the judgment is to be treated in the same manner as a local one. A judgment is the official decision or finding of a court on the respective rights of the involved parties. UEFJA applies only to final judgments. As a general rule, child support arrearages that have been reduced to judgment are considered final judgments and thus can be filed under UEFJA.

#### SUMMARY INFORMATION ON COLLECTION TECHNIQUES

Table 11-7 shows the percentage of child support collections obtained through the use of selected enforcement techniques. According to the OCSE, most CSE collections come from noncustodial parents who are complying with their support orders. However, the information is not provided in the OCSE annual report, which identifies only collection techniques that are concentrated on delinquent payments. The report for fiscal year 1993 shows that 64 percent of the \$8.9 billion in child support payments collected that year was obtained through the more publicized enforcement techniques: wage withholding, Federal income tax refund offset, State income tax refund offset, and unemployment compensation intercept. The remaining 36 percent is listed as collected by other means. Officials said most of these other collections come from noncustodial parents who were complying with their support orders by sending



-----						
	Total collections....		5,241	6,010	6,886	
7,965	8,909	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
-----						

\1\The OCSE does not designate the source of most of these collections. According to the OCSE, the majority of collections in the other category came from noncustodial parents who were complying with their support orders by sending their payments to the CSE agency. Moreover, the OCSE officials maintain that reliability of collection data lessen when specified by techniques of collection.

Source: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Office of Child Support Enforcement. ``Child Support Enforcement Statistics, Fiscal Year 1993.''

#### BANKRUPTCY AND CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT

The 1975 child support legislation included a provision that stated that an assigned child support obligation was not discharged in bankruptcy (i.e., a person filing bankruptcy was not relieved of his child support obligation). In 1978 this provision was repealed and incorporated into the 1978 uniform law on bankruptcy. The bankruptcy law also listed exceptions to discharge including alimony, maintenance or support due a spouse, former spouse, or child of the debtor in connection with a separation agreement, divorce decree, or property settlement. In 1981, the provision stating that a child support obligation assigned to the State as a condition of AFDC eligibility is not dischargeable in bankruptcy was reinstated. In 1984, a provision was enacted that provided that child support obligations that have been assigned to the State as part of the CSE program may not be discharged in

bankruptcy,  
regardless of whether they are on behalf of an AFDC family  
or a  
non-AFDC family and regardless of whether the debtor was  
married to the child's other parent.

#### LINKAGE BETWEEN AFDC AND CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT

The Social Security Act requires every State operating  
an  
AFDC program to run a CSE program. Federal law requires  
applicants for, and recipients of, AFDC to assign their  
support  
rights to the State in order to receive AFDC. In addition,  
each  
applicant or recipient must cooperate with the State if  
necessary to (1) establish the paternity of a child born  
outside of marriage, and (2) obtain child support payments,  
unless it is found not to be in the best interest of the  
child  
to do so.

Under the law, AFDC recipients or applicants may be  
excused  
from the requirement of cooperation if the AFDC agency  
determines that good cause for noncooperation exists,  
taking  
into consideration the best interests of the child on whose  
behalf aid is claimed. The determination is made according  
to  
standards in Federal regulations, the so-called good cause  
regulations. If good cause is found not to exist and if the  
relative with whom a child is living still refuses to  
cooperate, the relative is to be disqualified from AFDC and  
the  
child's benefits are to be sent in the form of a protective  
payment to a person other than the caretaker relative. (The  
same is true of refusal to assign to the State support  
rights:  
the child will not be disqualified from AFDC, but will  
receive

AFDC benefits only in the form of protective payments.) Circumstances under which cooperation may be found to be against the best interests of the child are defined to include:  
situations in which cooperation is reasonably anticipated to  
result in physical or emotional harm to the child, or  
physical  
or emotional harm to the caretaker relative, of such nature that it reduces the capacity to care for the child adequately;  
situations in which the child was conceived as a result of incest or rape; and situations in which legal procedures are  
underway for the child's adoption. Families who do not receive  
AFDC assistance also are eligible for CSE and paternity determination services if they apply for services.

#### FUNDING

The Federal Government currently reimburses each State  
66  
percent of the cost of administering its CSE program. When the  
program began in 1975, the Federal match was 75 percent. In 1982, Public Law 97-248 reduced the Federal match to 70 percent  
(fiscal years 1983-87). In 1984 Public Law 98-378 reduced the  
Federal match to 68 percent in fiscal year 1988 and fiscal year  
1989, and to 66 percent in fiscal year 1990 and years thereafter. These costs include moneys for locate services, paternity establishment, establishment of child support orders,  
and enforcement services.

The Federal Government also pays 90 percent of State costs  
of developing and improving management information systems, including expenditures on the hardware (i.e., computers)

and 90 percent of laboratory costs incurred in determining paternity.

The Federal Government pays most of the costs of State CSE programs. States receive Federal funds to pay a majority share of the costs of operating CSE programs plus Federal incentive payments based on total collections and cost-effectiveness of their programs. State programs receive additional funding from the State government. Although the actual dollars contributed by the Federal Government are greater, the level of funding allocated by the State or local government determines the amount of resources available to the CSE agency.

#### INCENTIVE PAYMENTS TO STATES

In most States, the State share of CSE collections made on behalf of AFDC families can be calculated by subtracting the Federal medical assistance percentage from 100 percent (in some States, local governments also are entitled to part of the State's share of collections). In addition, States and localities receive Federal CSE incentive payments that come entirely from the Federal share of child support collections.

The revised incentive formula, effective October 1, 1985, was designed to encourage States to develop CSE programs that emphasize collections on behalf of both AFDC and non-AFDC families, and to improve the program's cost effectiveness.

Under the incentive formula, each State receives an incentive payment equal to at least 6 percent of the State's total amount of AFDC support collections for the year, plus



at  
least 6 percent of the State's total amount of non-AFDC  
collections for the year. The amount of the State's  
incentive  
payment could reach a high of 10 percent of the AFDC  
collections plus 10 percent of the non-AFDC collections,  
depending on the State's ratio of child support collections  
to  
administrative costs. (See table 11-8.)

There is a limit, however, on the incentive payment for  
non-AFDC collections. The incentive payments for such  
collections may not exceed 115 percent of incentive  
payments  
for AFDC collections. (This percentage was 100 percent in  
fiscal year 1986 and fiscal year 1987, 105 percent in  
fiscal  
year 1988, 110 percent in fiscal year 1989, and 115 percent  
in  
fiscal year 1990 and each year thereafter.)

TABLE 11-8.--INCENTIVE PAYMENT STRUCTURE

-----  
-----

Incentive

payment

received

(percent)

-----  
-----

Collection-to-cost ratio:

Less than 1.4 to	
1.....	6.0
At least 1.4 to	
1.....	6.5
At least 1.6 to	
1.....	7.0
At least 1.8 to	

1.....	7.5
At least 2.0 to	
1.....	8.0
At least 2.2 to	
1.....	8.5
At least 2.4 to	
1.....	9.0
At least 2.6 to	
1.....	9.5
At least 2.8 to	
1.....	10.0
-----	
-----	

The incentive formula seeks to assure that States provide equitable treatment for both AFDC and non-AFDC families. Under the old system, a State that incurred administrative costs to collect support for a non-AFDC family did not receive an incentive payment since incentives were paid only for AFDC collections. This practice generally resulted in the neglect of non-AFDC cases. The new incentive formula aims to remedy that by making payments for non-AFDC collections. At the same time it has placed a limit on non-AFDC incentive payments so as to lessen the possibility that States would merely transfer to the CSE program child support activities which were previously financed out of State and/or local moneys, with no increase in the level of child support services.

At State option, laboratory costs (for blood testing, etc.) to establish paternity may be excluded from the State's administrative costs in calculating the State's collection-to-

cost ratios for purposes of determining the incentive payment.

In addition, for purposes of calculating these ratios, interstate collections are credited to both the initiating and

responding States. Incentives are paid according to the collection-to-cost ratios (ratio of AFDC collections to total

administrative costs and ratio of non-AFDC collections to total

administrative costs) shown in table 11-8.

Before 1984, a State that initiated a successful action to

collect child support from another State generally did not receive an incentive payment. Rather, the jurisdiction that made the collection received the incentive payment. Public Law

98-378 provides that both States involved in an interstate collection be credited with the collection for purposes of computing incentive payments. This double-counting is intended

to encourage States to pursue interstate cases as energetically

as they pursue intrastate cases. States now will pay incentive

for interstate cases to themselves out of the Federal share of

collections they distribute.

In addition to substantial Federal reimbursement, States

may use fees and cost recovery to help finance the CSE program

(discussed later). Such fees and costs recovered from non-AFDC

cases must be subtracted from the State's total administrative

cost before calculating the Federal reimbursement amount;

however, the lower administrative cost figure may result in greater Federal incentive payments by improving the State's collection-to-cost ratio.

## PAYMENTS TO AFDC FAMILIES

Families receiving AFDC benefits automatically qualify (free of charge) for CSE services. Their cases are referred to the CSE agency. Federal law requires AFDC families (and applicants), as a condition of eligibility for aid, to assign their support rights to the State, to cooperate with the State in establishing the paternity of a child born outside of marriage, and to cooperate with the State in obtaining support payments. The provision requiring the AFDC applicant or recipient to assign to the State her rights to support covers both current support and any arrears which have accrued, and lasts as long as the family receives AFDC. When the family no longer receives AFDC, the mother or caretaker relative regains her right to collect current support, but if there are arrears, the State may claim those arrears up to the amount paid out as AFDC benefits.

Child support payments made on behalf of a child receiving AFDC are supposed to be paid to the CSE agency rather than directly to the family. If the child support collection is insufficient to disqualify the family from receiving AFDC payments, the family receives its full monthly AFDC grant plus the first \$50 of the child support payment made in the child's behalf for that month. The remainder of that monthly child support payment is distributed to reimburse the State and Federal Governments in proportion to their assistance to the family. If the family's income, including the child support

payment, is sufficient to make the family ineligible for AFDC payments, the family's AFDC benefits are ended, and future child support payments are paid directly from the noncustodial parent to the family.

#### Supplemental payments in ``fill-the-gap'' States

Notwithstanding the above procedures, some States are required to provide monthly supplemental payments to AFDC recipients who have less disposable income now than they would have had in July 1975 because child support is paid to the CSE agency instead of directly to the family. States required to pay supplemental payment are often referred to as ``fill-the-gap'' States. These States pay less assistance than their full need standard, and allow recipients to use child support income to make up all or part of the difference between the payment made by the State and the State's need standard.

Section 402(a)(28) of the Social Security Act requires States that had a fill-the-gap policy in 1975 and currently have such a policy, to add to the AFDC benefit all or part of the child support collection (the amount which would have caused no reduction in the AFDC benefit if it had been paid directly to the family).

Information obtained from the Office of Child Support Enforcement (June 1990) indicates that seven States that had fill-the-gap policies in July 1975 also have them now and thus must follow the benefit calculation rules of section 402(a)(28) when taking account of child support collections for AFDC

families. They are: Georgia, Maine, Mississippi, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and Wyoming. Another 13 jurisdictions, which had fill-the-gap policies in July 1975, no longer have them. Were they to resume a fill-the-gap practice, they also would be required to treat child support collections as though they were paid directly to the family. These jurisdictions are: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Indiana, Missouri, New Mexico, Puerto Rico, Texas, Virgin Islands, Washington, and West Virginia.

#### PAYMENTS TO NON-AFDC FAMILIES

Families who do not receive AFDC assistance also are eligible if they apply for services, unless they have left the AFDC rolls and are automatically provided continued CSE services.

The entire amount of child support payments collected on behalf of a non-AFDC child is paid directly to the family. Even so, the State still receives the Federal reimbursement (currently 66 percent) for the costs of establishing and enforcing child support obligations for these non-AFDC cases. In some States, parents may be ordered by the court to make and receive support payments directly or through a court registry or State child support clearinghouse without any formal application to the CSE agency. When this occurs, the money collected, since it is outside the CSE system, cannot be counted in determining the amount of Federal reimbursement to the State.

Non-AFDC families participate in the CSE program on a voluntary basis, except for Medicaid-only cases. Federal

funding for services to non-AFDC families was made a permanent part of the program in 1980 by Public Law 96-272. Federal law requires the State to charge an application fee of up to \$25 for CSE services for non-AFDC families. Some States charge the full \$25, some less, and others use State funds to pay the fee or seek collection from the noncustodial parent.

In addition, CSE agencies are allowed to recover the actual costs of their services to non-AFDC families from either the custodial parent or the noncustodial parent, once current support has been covered. In practice, this means that costs are deducted from arrears that otherwise would be paid directly to the non-AFDC client. Recovery of these costs is contingent on payment of the arrears. However, it is the practice of most States not to recover the cost of their services. The amount of fees collected by the States for purposes of processing non-AFDC cases plus the amount of processing costs recovered by the States in excess of the fees charged decreases the amount of States' expenditures eligible for Federal CSE funding. Moreover, any interest earned on money from fees or recovered costs is considered CSE program income and must be used by the States to offset program expenditures. In fiscal year 1992, fees received and costs recovered for non-AFDC cases amounted to \$29.2 million.

Several States try to recoup costs in non-AFDC cases by deducting their costs from the actual child support payment before sending it to the custodial parent. Because some of these custodial parents are only dollars away from qualifying for AFDC and because it generally is easier to get on welfare than to earn one's way off, some policymakers argue that this practice can result in welfare dependency; others maintain that it is unfair to the children.

#### ARREARAGES

To receive AFDC benefits, a custodial parent must assign to the State her right to collect child support payments. This assignment covers current support and any arrears, and lasts as long as the family receives AFDC. When the family stops receiving AFDC, the assignment ends. The mother regains her right to collect current support. However, if there are arrears, the State may claim those arrears up to the amount paid out in AFDC. As described earlier, when a mother receives AFDC and the CSE agency makes a collection on her behalf, it must distribute the collection in accordance with Federal law. First, up to the first \$50 collected is given to the family (a disregard that does not affect the family's AFDC benefit or eligibility status). Second, the Federal and State Governments are reimbursed for the AFDC benefits paid to the family in that month. Third, if there is money left, the family receives it up to the amount of the current month's child support obligation.



Fourth, if there is still money left, the State keeps it to reimburse itself for any arrears owed to it under the AFDC assignment. If no arrears are owed the State, the money is used to pay arrears owed to the family. Such moneys are considered income under the AFDC program and would reduce the family's AFDC benefit.

In the case of non-AFDC families, the sequence is different. First, if the family never received AFDC, all child support collections made on the family's behalf are sent to the family. Second, if the family had received AFDC before, collections go toward payment on the current month's support obligation. If any money is left, and it is considered an arrearage, the State decides whether the arrears will be paid to the family or State first. If the arrears are paid to the State, they are distributed between the Federal and State Governments as reimbursement for past AFDC benefits. Third, if there are no arrears, the collection is forwarded to the family and is credited toward future CSE payments.

According to the OCSE 17th annual report, in fiscal year 1992, the amount of total prior year support due, i.e., arrearages, amounted to \$23.9 billion; \$1.8 billion (8 percent) was paid in fiscal year 1992 on prior years' arrears.

#### Distribution of Collections

Collections made on behalf of families receiving AFDC directly offset AFDC benefit costs and (except for the first \$50 of current monthly support payments, which go directly to

the family, and are disregarded as income for AFDC purposes) are shared between the Federal Government and the States in accordance with the matching formula used for the individual State's AFDC program.

In general, the initial determination of the Federal share of CSE collections is based on the rate of Federal financial participation in AFDC benefit costs. The Federal share of AFDC benefit costs generally is determined by the Federal medical assistance percentage. The Federal share of AFDC benefit costs (and, therefore, the Federal share of CSE/AFDC collections) is inversely related to State per capita income; within limits, the lower the State per capita income, the greater the Federal share. Nationally, this figure is about 55 percent. It ranges from a minimum of 50 percent to a statutory maximum of 83 percent. In fiscal year 1993, the highest matching rate was 79.01 percent (the Federal match for AFDC benefit costs in Mississippi). In fiscal year 1994, Mississippi's Federal AFDC matching rate dropped to 78.85 percent.

Even though the national average (gross) Federal share of AFDC collections is about 56 percent, Federal funds reimburse States for 66 percent of their CSE administrative costs. This lowers the net Federal share of support collections.

#### USE OF SUPPORT COLLECTIONS

The Federal share of child support collections paid by

noncustodial parents of children receiving AFDC benefits is used first to pay incentives to States on their AFDC and non-AFDC collections. The remainder is used to offset Federal AFDC benefit costs. In fiscal year 1993, incentive payments amounted to \$339 million, 44 percent of the Federal share of CSE collections. Payments made on behalf of non-AFDC families go to the family.

Neither Federal law nor regulations dictate the use of the State's share of child support savings; there are no Federal strings attached. However, child support collections in and of themselves can (1) prevent families from qualifying for welfare programs, (2) remove families from welfare rolls when the amount collected is sufficient, (3) partially offset State AFDC payments to families whose monthly child support is insufficient to remove them from welfare rolls, (4) recover or prevent the need for Medicaid payments through reimbursement from private health insurers in cases where the noncustodial parent has coverage, or where coverage is available, and (5) offset AFDC foster care costs. In addition, many States have chosen to reinvest child support savings back into the CSE program to increase the quality and effectiveness of the program. Some States use child support savings in other children and family programs. Others use child support savings wherever the State budget indicates the need.

EXTENT TO WHICH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BEARS COST OF THE

## CHILD SUPPORT

### ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM

One of the purposes of the CSE program is to reduce public expenditures on welfare by obtaining support from noncustodial parents on an ongoing basis. The CSE program also provides services to nonwelfare parents who apply for services. One purpose of the non-AFDC component of the program is welfare cost avoidance, that is, preventing families from going on AFDC (or other welfare programs) by collecting child support from noncustodial parents.

Even with the reduced Federal matching rate (from 75 percent in 1975 to 66 percent in 1991), the Federal Government has never recovered its costs from the CSE program. Under the current financing arrangement, States can run inefficient programs and still make a profit from the CSE program. The cost of the CSE program to the Federal Government, however, has continued, since 1984, to increase steadily.

To illustrate, assume that an inefficient State spends \$200 to collect a \$300 child support payment from a noncustodial parent whose children are receiving AFDC benefits. Such a State (with a collection-to-cost ratio of 1.5) would qualify for an incentive payment of \$19.50 (6.5 percent of AFDC collections, see table 11-9). Since the State pays 34 percent of administrative costs, the collection would cost the State \$68, but the State's share of the collection would total \$144.50. This means that the State would pay 34 percent of the cost and

get 48 percent of the collection. Thus, the net gain to the State would be \$76.50.\7\ On the other hand, the collection would cost the Federal Government \$132, and its share of the collection would amount to \$105.50. Thus, the collection would cost the Federal Government \$26.50. In other words, the Federal Government would pay 66 percent of the cost and get 35 percent of the collection. The recipient would get nearly 17 percent of the collection (the \$50 passthrough). Table 11-11 shows that although the CSE program is a net gain for the States, it is a significant net cost to the Federal Government.

\7\This is a simplified example. Actually, the State's share of savings is determined by adding the State's share of AFDC collections to the State's AFDC and non-AFDC incentive payments. Its share of total administrative costs is subtracted from these revenues. The calculations assume a 50-50 matching rate for AFDC benefits.

TABLE 11-9.--STATE AND FEDERAL SHARE OF CHILD SUPPORT COLLECTIONS

	[AFDC Family]	
	Collections	Cost of collections
Net gain		

-----		
State share.....	\$125+\$19.50=\$144.50	\$68
+\$76.50		
Federal share.....	125- 19.50= 105.50	132
-26.50		
Payment to recipient.	50.00	0
+ 50.00		
-----		
Total.....	300.00	200
+100.00		
-----		
-----		

The point at which a State breaks even (exactly recovers collection costs) in child support payments on behalf of AFDC recipients primarily depends on the share of AFDC benefit costs that it pays, and this, in turn, is related inversely to State per capita income. This can be shown by calculating the approximate breakeven ratios (collections needed per dollar of administrative cost) for States with different Federal AFDC matching rates, but the same collection cost per case. In the following examples, it is assumed that the cost of making a collection is \$100 per month per AFDC case. (This figure was the national average cost for fiscal year 1988; it was obtained by dividing total CSE administrative costs of AFDC cases by the average number of AFDC cases in which a collection was made).

Example 1.--State that pays 50 percent of AFDC benefit costs--maximum State share. (In fiscal year 1990, 11 States and the District of Columbia were in this position.)

Under the existing system, the breakeven collection amount for a State spending \$100 per AFDC case to collect child support payments, retaining the maximum State share (50 percent) of AFDC/CSE collections, paying the standard 34 percent of CSE administrative costs, and receiving the minimum incentive payment of 6 percent, is \$105.\8\ That is, the State need collect only \$1.05 per \$1 of total administrative cost in order to recover its share of costs. Conversely, the Federal breakeven ratio for this State's collections is approximately 2.17. That is, the State must collect about \$217 in order for the Federal Government to break even.\9\ (See table 11-10 and chart 11-1.)

-----  
 \8\State share of collections = State share of costs at breakeven

$$\begin{aligned} .5(C-\$50) + .06[(C-\$50)+\$50] &= .34Y \\ .56C &= .34Y + \$25 \end{aligned}$$

Assume State receives 50-50 matching rate for AFDC benefit costs and assume  $Y = \$100$  (national average in fiscal year 1988).  $C$  = total collections,  $Y$  = cost of collections, and  $(C-\$50) = X$ , which is the public share of collections. The incentive payment equals 6 percent of total collections.

\9\Federal share of collections = Federal share of costs at breakeven

$$\begin{aligned} .5(C-\$50) - .08[(C-\$50)+\$50] &= .66Y \\ .42C &= .66Y + \$25 \end{aligned}$$

Assume State receives 50-50 matching rate for AFDC

benefit costs  
and assume  $Y = \$100$  (national average in fiscal year 1988).  
 $C =$  total  
collections,  $Y =$  cost of collections, and  $(C - \$50) = X$ ,  
which is the  
public share of collections. The incentive payment, a  
function of the  
collection-to-cost ratio, equals 8 percent of total  
collections in this  
example where the collection-to-cost ratio is 2.17 (see  
table 8).

-----  
-----

Example 2.--State that pays the minimum share (less  
than 20  
percent) of AFDC benefit costs.

This situation is illustrated by the case of  
Mississippi,  
which had a Federal matching rate of 80.18 percent (and,  
thus,  
a State matching rate of 19.82 percent) for AFDC benefit  
costs.  
The breakeven collection amount for Mississippi, assuming  
it  
also spent \$100 per AFDC case to collect child support  
payments, would be \$164. This is a breakeven ratio of 1.64.  
Conversely, the Federal breakeven ratio for Mississippi's  
CSE  
program is approximately 1.44. (See table 11-10 and chart  
11-  
1.)

These illustrations show that the States that are  
entitled  
to a relatively small proportion of child support  
collections  
(because of paying a small share of AFDC benefit costs)  
have to  
collect more child support payments per administrative  
dollar  
than other States to recover their costs (other things



being  
equal). (See table 11-10.)

TABLE 11-10.--STATE AND FEDERAL BREAKEVEN POINTS PER  
DOLLAR OF  
COLLECTION COSTS\1\ FOR SELECTED FEDERAL AFDC MATCHING  
RATES

-----	
-----	
Federal	State
breakeven	breakeven
-----	
-----	
Federal AFDC matching rate:	
50 percent.....	\$1.05
\$2.17	
60 percent.....	1.17
1.83	
70 percent.....	1.36
1.60	
80 percent.....	1.64
1.44	
-----	
-----	

\1\The breakeven point is the amount of collections at  
which the  
jurisdiction exactly recovers its share of the collection  
costs. In  
this table collection costs are assumed to be \$100 per  
month, the  
fiscal year 1988 national average cost of AFDC  
collections. This  
average was obtained by dividing fiscal year 1988 AFDC  
expenditures by  
the average number of AFDC cases in which a collection  
was made that  
year.

-----  
-----

CHART 11-1. STATE/FEDERAL PROFIT/LOSS AT VARIOUS SUPPORT  
COLLECTION

AMOUNTS, AND AFDC MATCHING RATES

<CHART 11-1>

Table 11-11 shows that during the period 1979-93, the CSE program has produced new revenue for the States but incurred cost to the Federal Government. The States' share of collections has exceeded their share of administrative costs in each year, but the Federal share of collections has fallen increasingly short of their share of administrative costs. Net Federal costs have risen sharply from \$43 million in fiscal year 1979 to \$740 million in fiscal year 1993, a real increase of 745 percent (constant fiscal year 1993 dollars). Although net State savings increased in current dollars, from \$244 million in fiscal year 1979 to \$462 million in fiscal year 1993, there was a 7 percent decrease in constant fiscal year 1993 dollars.

In fiscal year 1992, 11 jurisdictions (Alabama, Arizona, Guam, Louisiana, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Mexico, Puerto Rico, Texas, the Virgin Islands, and West Virginia) did not achieve a savings from their CSE program. Moreover, in that same year, in only five States (Indiana, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming) was the Federal share of child support savings positive. Despite the discussion above about breakeven points, it is not clear why these 11 jurisdictions did not recover their costs from the CSE program, nor why

the  
Federal Government recovered its costs in the five other  
States  
(mentioned above).

TABLE 11-11.--FEDERAL AND STATE SHARE OF CHILD SUPPORT  
` ` SAVINGS, ' '

FISCAL YEARS 1979-93  
[In millions]

		Federal	State
		share of	share
of	Net	child	child
public		support	
support	savings	savings\1\	
savings			
Fiscal year:			
1979.....		-\$43	
\$244	\$201		
1980.....		-103	
230	127		
1981.....		-128	
261	133		
1982.....		-148	
307	159		
1983.....		-138	
312	174		
1984.....		-105	
366	260		
1985.....		-231	
317	86		
1986.....		-264	
274	9		
1987.....		-337	
342	5		

1988.....	-355
381        26	
1989.....	-480
403        -77	
1990.....	-528
338        -190	
1991.....	-586
385        -201	
1992.....	-605
434        -171	
1993.....	-740
462        -278	

-----  
 \1\Negative ``savings'' are costs.

Source: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.  
 Office of Child  
 Support Enforcement. Annual Reports to Congress, various  
 years.

Table 11-11 also shows that the CSE program no longer produces a net public savings (\$201 million savings in fiscal year 1979). Instead, in fiscal year 1993, the net cost of the program to the taxpayer was estimated at \$278 million, up \$107 million from fiscal year 1992. In addition, table 11-11 shows public savings dropping 67 percent from fiscal year 1984 to fiscal year 1985. This sudden decrease in public savings primarily was caused by the provision in 1984 law, first effective in fiscal year 1985, requiring that up to the first \$50 received by the CSE agency on behalf of an AFDC family be passed through to the family without affecting their eligibility for AFDC or AFDC benefit payments. In fiscal year 1985, about 3.5 percent of CSE collections, \$93.8 million

went

to AFDC families (pursuant to the \$50 passthrough rule). In fiscal year 1993, \$364.2 million (about 4.1 percent of CSE collections) was passed through to AFDC families. If these funds had not been spent to increase the incomes of poor children and their parents on AFDC, the net public savings from child support enforcement would have been a positive \$86.2 million in fiscal year 1993.

Some question whether States have sufficient incentive to minimize costs, most of which are paid by the Federal Government. However, others argue that the intangible benefits of the CSE program make it worthwhile, despite considerations of cost-effectiveness. It is a fact that a large segment of the program, namely the non-AFDC component, by definition, provides no direct savings to the States or the Federal Government. Nevertheless, the non-AFDC component of the CSE program can achieve welfare cost avoidance in the following ways: by providing non-AFDC families with additional income sufficient to make them decide not to apply for public assistance (AFDC, food stamp, or Medicaid), even though eligible; by making non-AFDC families ineligible for public assistance and by continuing to make these families ineligible by reason of income; and by reducing the benefit levels of non-AFDC families who do receive public assistance benefits.

A recent study indicated that there was \$1 in indirect savings, or welfare cost avoidance, for every \$4 in child support collections made on behalf of non-AFDC families. If this were true in fiscal year 1992, the public avoided over \$1.6 billion in additional welfare costs, more than paying for the program.

It also should be noted that once the CSE system matures (i.e., once the majority of existing cases have child support orders), the cost-effectiveness of the system probably will improve. However, because the benefits of establishing paternity or a child support award occur in future years as well as the current year, a static, point-in-time, analysis of costs and collections fails to account for the complexity and dynamic nature of the CSE system. It is an unfortunate irony that the more effective the program becomes at cost-avoidance, the less effective it will appear in such static calculations of ``savings.''

#### ROLE OF AUTOMATED SYSTEMS

In 1980, Congress authorized 90 percent Federal matching funds on an open-ended basis for CSE automated data systems, instead of the regular program rate (75 percent in 1980, 66 percent in fiscal year 1990 and years thereafter). Funds go to States that elect to establish an automated data processing and information retrieval system designed to assist management in the administration of the State plan, so as to control, account for, and monitor all factors in the support enforcement, collection, and paternity determination process. Funds may be used to plan, design, develop, and install or enhance the system. The Secretary of DHHS must approve the system as meeting specified conditions before matching is available.

In 1984, Congress made the 90 percent rate available to

pay  
for the acquisition of computer hardware and necessary  
software. The 1984 legislation also specified that if a  
State  
met the Federal requirement for 90 percent matching, it  
could  
use its 90 percent matching funds to pay for the  
development  
and improvement of income withholding and other procedures  
required by the 1984 law.

In May 1986, the OCSE established a transfer policy  
requiring States seeking the 90 percent Federal matching  
rate  
to transfer existing automated systems from other States  
rather  
than to develop new ones, unless there were a compelling  
reason  
not to.

In 1988, Congress required States without comprehensive  
statewide automated systems to submit an advance planning  
document to the OCSE by October 1, 1991, for the  
development of  
such systems. All State systems must be approved as fully  
operating by October 1, 1995, at which time the 90 percent  
matching rate is to end. The new law allows many  
requirements  
for automated systems to be waived under certain  
circumstances.

For instance, the DHHS Secretary may waive a requirement if  
(1)  
a State demonstrates that it has an alternative system  
enabling  
it to substantially comply with program requirements or (2)  
a  
State provides assurance that additional steps will be  
taken to  
improve its program.

All States and territories submitted advance planning  
documents for automated child support systems as required  
by  
the Family Support Act of 1988. As of July 1, 1992, OCSE

had approved plans for all States and territories. According to an August 1992 GAO report (IMTEC-92-46), the Federal Government had spent \$258 million at the end of fiscal year 1991 in enhanced 90 percent matching funds for child support automation.

It is estimated that another \$863 million in 90 percent matching funds will be spent by October 1, 1995.

According to a February 1989 GAO report entitled, ``Child Support: State Progress in Developing Automated Enforcement Systems,' ' States that develop automated systems with regular program funds also must obtain advance approval by the OCSE for expenditures that exceed \$200,000. The GAO reported that oversight of system acquisition and operation under the regular program funding is less stringent than that of systems with enhanced funding.

#### IMPACT OF CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT ON AFDC AND POVERTY STATUS

For the 5.0 million women due child support payments in 1989 (including the nearly 1.2 million women who did not receive any payment), the average annual amount of child support owed was \$2,252. The average annual amount of child support for the 3.7 million women who received child support payments was \$2,995. If the full amount of payment due had been made to all women owed child support, the average annual amount would have been \$3,292. (The average AFDC benefit per family in 1989 was about \$4,600.) In 1989, 1.2 million (37 percent) of the 3.2 million women rearing children alone with incomes



below

the poverty level were supposed to receive child support payments. If full payment had been made to those 1.2 million

women, 140,000 (4.4 percent of the 3.2 million and 11.8 percent

of the 1.2 million) of them would have received enough income

from child support payments to put them above the poverty level. This assumes that none of those poor women was a recipient of AFDC. For those receiving AFDC, the maximum they

usually receive in the form of child support payments (via the

CSE agency) is \$50 monthly.

It is clear from the above illustration that the low level

of child support awards due in 1989 limited the CSE program's

antipoverty impact. The antipoverty effectiveness of the CSE

program might be marginal for some families, given that Census

Bureau data indicate that even being a member of a two-parent

family is no guarantee against poverty. In 1991, 7.7 percent of

white two-parent families with children under age 18 had incomes below the poverty level and 12.4 percent of black two-

parent families were poor. This means that being in a two-parent family is not as much of a protection against poverty

for blacks as it is for whites. Since the costs of achieving a

moderate standard of living are sometimes higher for two households than for one, when a family breaks up, the father

may have less money available to contribute to the support of

his children. Thus, because the poverty rate of black

children

is relatively high even in two-parent families, the potential

of child support for reducing the poverty rate of black children may be especially limited.

In 1989, \$16.3 billion in child support payments were due,

but actual payments totaled \$11.2 billion. In 1985, \$10.9 billion in child support payments were due, but actual payments

totaled \$7.2 billion. This meant that \$3.7 billion or 33 percent of collections owed in 1985 went unpaid. While the almost \$11 billion owed in child support in 1985 is a substantial amount, two basic studies indicate that fathers have the ability to pay from \$24 to \$30 billion annually in child support.

One study points out that the size of the estimate of the

total amount that noncustodial fathers can afford to contribute

to their children's maintenance (\$26.6 billion annually) says

nothing about the distribution of this money by income group.

The study indicates that children whose fathers are in the highest income quintile would receive 46 percent of the \$26.6

billion and that those whose fathers are in the lowest quintile

would receive 3 percent of the \$26.6 billion.

Another study based on data from the Panel Study of Income

Dynamics, which covers divorces and separations during the period 1968-1981, indicates that poor children have not necessarily had poor fathers, and that increased child support

payments from the absent fathers could substantially reduce their years of poverty. The study states that ``the largest portion of the times when the custodial mother's family is poor

are times when the absent father has enough income to keep

himself and any new family he has formed out of poverty.''  
This

report concludes that if increased child support payments merely replace welfare support, many childhood years would remain in poverty. Some of the reasons for this finding are:

(1) the absence of support awards in a large number of cases,  
(2) nonpayment or underpayment of existing awards, and (3) low  
award levels relative to the income of noncustodial  
parents.

Although the antipoverty potential of the CSE program is limited and difficult to estimate, it is clear that child support payments could have a large impact on AFDC costs. In fiscal year 1992, the sum collected by the CSE agency from AFDC parents equalled 11.4 percent of AFDC benefits. Researchers say that this overstates the impact of the CSE program, inasmuch as AFDC mothers would have collected some support if there were no CSE program and they were not required to give their child support rights to the welfare agency. One researcher estimates that only about 25 percent of the gain can be attributed directly to the CSE program. (This figure, applied to fiscal year 1992, leads to the estimate that if there had been no CSE program that year, mothers would have collected 8.5 percent of AFDC benefits, compared to the actual sum of 11.4 percent collected by the CSE agency.) The researcher said that if a successful system of mandatory wage withholding were adopted and greater efforts made to establish obligations, the CSE program might recover between 15 percent and 20 percent of

total AFDC benefit expenditures. The OCSE annual fiscal year 1992 data show 10 States recovering at least 20 percent of total AFDC benefit payments through the efforts of the CSE program (on average, these are relatively smaller States with low AFDC benefit levels).

In addition, there is much research that indicates that child support payments could help reduce the severity of poverty for many non-AFDC children even if it did not end their poverty.

TABLE 11-12.--ESTIMATED TOTAL NUMBER AND PERCENT OF AFDC FAMILIES AFFECTED BY \$50 PASSTHROUGH: 1985, 1990, 1992,\1\ AND 1993

Estimated		Percent of families affected				AFDC
families	State					
families	affected				1993	
1993	1985	1990	1992	1993		
-----						
-----						
Alabama.....						
50,994	18,510	11.7	19.1	33.4	36.3	
Alaska.....						
10,048	1,889	11.9	20.7	18.8	18.8	
Arizona.....						
68,725	2,695	4.8	4.9	7.3	3.9	
Arkansas.....						
26,098	7,697	15.9	19.7	27.7	29.5	
California.....						
717,181	82,517	13.8	12.7	11.3	11.5	
Colorado.....						

41,152	8,510	14.1	15.1	18.5	20.7
Connecticut.....					
55,072	11,162	25.6	19.3	18.3	20.3
Delaware.....					
11,256	2,511	21.7	18.0	21.6	22.3
District of Columbia.....					
24,589	1,872	5.8	7.5	7.9	7.6
Florida.....					
247,505	37,925	11.4	24.0	15.9	15.3
Georgia.....					
139,903	26,813	5.3	19.6	17.8	19.2
Guam.....					
1,363	489	10.5	19.9	34.6	35.9
Hawaii.....					
17,452	3,039	20.5	13.2	19.6	17.4
Idaho.....					
7,436	3,922	46.7	46.6	49.6	52.7
Illinois.....					
220,972	17,782	5.5	7.9	7.4	8.1
Indiana.....					
68,904	23,807	25.9	27.8	43.4	34.6
Iowa.....					
34,443	9,150	22.7	22.8	23.9	26.6
Kansas.....					
27,729	9,664	15.2	24.0	31.5	34.9
Kentucky.....					
73,601	12,534	7.6	13.4	15.5	17.0
Louisiana.....					
88,712	8,238	6.9	8.5	9.3	9.3
Maine.....					
21,161	7,339	25.6	39.3	23.0	34.7
Maryland.....					
79,222	14,347	15.0	10.9	18.6	18.1
Massachusetts.....					
106,962	12,252	20.2	16.3	11.2	11.5
Michigan.....					
197,796	53,494	17.2	25.3	23.9	27.1
Minnesota.....					

57,147	20,076	22.5	28.0	29.8	35.1
Mississippi.....					
59,509	7,931	4.8	9.2	12.4	13.3
Missouri.....					
84,700	14,833	8.2	18.5	17.9	17.5
Montana.....					
10,535	1,906	13.9	15.2	18.3	18.1
Nebraska.....					
15,452	4,512	11.3	20.6	27.5	29.2
Nevada.....					
12,614	4,201	33.6	29.8	32.4	33.3
New Hampshire.....					
10,462	3,589	12.6	13.5	27.1	34.1
New Jersey.....					
121,685	25,361	15.4	15.8	19.9	20.8
New Mexico.....					
29,500	2,927	7.6	11.8	9.5	9.9
New York.....					
415,885	48,495	9.2	11.8	13.0	11.7
North Carolina.....					
127,390	24,211	15.0	19.5	18.9	19.0
North Dakota.....					
5,974	2,340	25.1	36.7	38.5	39.2
Ohio.....					
233,965	35,119	11.6	19.9	14.1	15.0
Oklahoma.....					
47,696	4,626	8.4	13.4	7.5	9.7
Oregon.....					
38,662	9,980	16.0	17.6	22.5	25.8
Pennsylvania.....					
194,826	50,941	16.3	20.8	24.9	26.2
Puerto Rico.....					
60,709	1,874	4.7	4.2	3.3	3.1
Rhode Island.....					
21,434	2,728	13.9	17.9	11.1	12.7
South Carolina.....					
52,110	13,173	8.9	26.3	23.8	25.3

South Dakota.....					
7,167	1,897	17.6	21.4	24.2	26.5
Tennessee.....					
102,909	10,988	9.8	15.2	11.4	10.7
Texas.....					
270,257	18,049	3.1	5.8	6.1	6.7
Utah.....					
18,229	4,721	26.9	23.7	25.7	25.9
Vermont.....					
8,570	3,439	21.9	36.5	35.9	40.1
Virgin Islands.....					
1,083	139	10.2	11.6	11.7	12.8
Virginia.....					
72,824	17,424	14.9	24.9	24.5	23.9
Washington.....					
85,259	27,243	18.0	24.8	28.7	32.0
West Virginia.....					
33,042	3,641	6.6	7.1	9.0	11.0
Wisconsin.....					
71,994	29,193	37.8	38.9	38.7	40.6
Wyoming.....					
6,324	1,535	8.0	21.7	26.2	24.3

-----

----

Nationwide total.....					
4,616,169	775,230	13.2	16.3	16.3	
16.8					

-----

-----

NA=Not available.

\1\These estimates are based on the number of ``paying'' child support cases and are a low estimate of the number of families affected.

Note: These estimates are based on the number of ``paying'' child support cases adjusted for comparability with AFDC families.

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement.

TABLE 11-13.--STATE PROFILE  
OF COLLECTIONS AND EXPENDITURES, FISCAL YEAR 1993\1\

[In millions of dollars]

-----  
-----  
-----

Child support collections

per dollar of total                      Incentive

Total	AFDC	Non-AFDC	Total
administrative expenditures		payments	
		State	
collections	collections	collections	expenditures
----- (estimate)			

AFDC/FC    Non-AFDC

Total            total            total

-----  
-----  
-----

Alabama.....				
\$113.2	\$22.5	\$90.7	\$34.6	3.27
0.65	2.62	\$3.8		
Alaska.....				
39.1	11.7	27.4	10.6	3.71
1.11	2.60	2.2		
Arizona.....				
66.6	18.6	48.0	37.1	1.79
0.50	1.29	2.2		
Arkansas.....				
49.1	16.2	32.9	15.3	3.20
1.06	2.15	2.1		
California.....				



736.9	335.2	401.6	290.6	2.54
1.15	1.38	48.4		
Colorado.....				
67.7	26.2	41.5	27.4	2.47
0.95	1.51	4.1		
Connecticut.....				
93.5	41.3	52.2	29.3	3.19
1.41	1.78	5.1		
Delaware.....				
26.7	7.8	18.9	11.1	2.39
0.70	1.69	1.1		
District of Columbia.....				
21.8	5.2	16.6	8.7	2.51
0.60	1.91	1.0		
Florida.....				
290.0	78.1	211.9	76.7	3.78
1.02	2.76	10.7		
Georgia.....				
205.6	84.6	120.9	46.0	4.47
1.84	2.63	13.9		
Guam.....				
5.0	2.3	2.7	2.7	1.89
0.88	1.00	0.4		
Hawaii.....				
37.3	9.1	28.3	9.8	3.79
0.92	2.87	1.2		
Idaho.....				
32.1	8.7	23.4	9.4	3.43
0.93	2.50	1.5		
Illinois.....				
183.9	55.7	128.1	77.8	2.36
0.72	1.65	8.1		
Indiana.....				
141.2	52.0	89.1	21.9	6.45
2.38	4.07	10.9		
Iowa.....				
109.3	36.8	72.5	21.2	5.14
1.73	3.41	5.3		
Kansas.....				
59.6	22.4	37.2	23.2	2.57
0.97	1.61	3.1		

Kentucky.....				
103.6	36.6	67.0	34.0	3.05
1.08	1.97	5.7		
Louisiana.....				
103.1	26.8	76.2	32.3	3.19
0.83	2.36	3.6		
Maine.....				
45.0	25.7	19.3	13.3	3.39
1.93	1.45	3.0		
Maryland.....				
219.1	51.3	167.8	48.0	4.56
1.07	3.49	5.5		
Massachusetts.....				
195.4	77.3	118.1	45.4	4.30
1.70	2.60	11.6		
Michigan.....				
874.5	169.6	704.9	103.7	8.43
1.64	6.80	24.9		
Minnesota.....				
214.5	56.0	158.5	51.1	4.20
1.10	3.10	6.8		
Mississippi.....				
53.5	21.6	31.9	24.3	2.20
0.89	1.31	3.0		
Missouri.....				
189.1	51.2	138.0	43.9	4.30
1.16	3.14	7.9		
Montana.....				
20.1	6.5	13.7	7.3	2.76
0.88	1.87	1.1		
Nebraska.....				
71.7	9.8	61.9	17.2	4.17
0.57	3.60	1.3		
Nevada.....				
37.6	7.0	30.6	15.8	2.39
0.45	1.94	1.7		
New Hampshire.....				
31.5	7.6	23.9	11.0	2.87
0.70	2.17	0.8		
New Jersey.....				
407.8	84.0	323.8	101.4	4.02

0.83	3.19	10.6		
New Mexico.....				
27.1	12.9	14.2	8.8	3.08
1.47	1.61	1.1		
New York.....				
536.4	184.6	351.8	172.9	3.10
1.07	2.03	22.2		
North Carolina.....				
197.3	70.3	127.0	61.7	3.20
1.14	2.06	9.2		
North Dakota.....				
18.7	6.1	12.6	4.6	4.05
1.32	2.73	1.0		
Ohio.....				
714.1	105.7	608.4	130.4	5.48
0.81	4.67	12.7		
Oklahoma.....				
52.2	18.8	33.4	16.7	3.13
1.13	2.00	2.9		
Oregon.....				
124.9	28.4	96.6	25.2	4.95
1.12	3.83	5.0		
Pennsylvania.....				
814.5	124.5	690.0	89.6	9.09
1.39	7.70	15.5		
Puerto Rico.....				
97.4	1.3	96.0	8.3	11.73
0.16	11.57	0.5		
Rhode Island.....				
26.7	15.0	11.7	6.1	4.35
2.44	1.91	1.8		
South Carolina.....				
79.3	24.6	54.7	20.4	3.88
1.20	2.68	2.8		
South Dakota.....				
18.1	5.1	13.1	3.7	4.90
1.37	3.53	0.8		
Tennessee.....				
116.2	33.4	82.7	21.4	5.42
1.56	3.86	4.5		
Texas.....				

309.5	66.2	243.3	134.1	2.31
0.49	1.81	9.8		
Utah.....				
56.2	19.5	36.7	19.6	2.86
0.99	1.87	2.4		
Vermont.....				
15.8	7.6	8.2	5.2	3.06
1.48	1.59	1.3		
Virgin Islands.....				
5.0	0.3	4.6	1.1	4.50
0.31	4.19	0.0		
Virginia.....				
151.9	39.6	112.3	49.2	3.09
0.80	2.28	6.0		
Washington.....				
307.3	100.3	206.9	89.8	3.42
1.12	2.30	15.6		
West Virginia.....				
49.0	16.9	32.1	17.7	2.77
0.95	1.82	1.5		
Wisconsin.....				
332.8	65.4	267.4	46.6	7.15
1.41	5.74	9.2		
Wyoming.....				
13.8	4.3	9.5	5.9	2.34
0.74	1.61	0.8		
-----				
-----				
U.S. Totals.....				
\$8,909.3	\$2,416.2	\$6,492.7	\$2,241.1	3.98
1.08	2.90	\$339.2		
-----				
-----				
-----				

\1\Totals may not add because of rounding.

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement.

TABLE 11-14.--TOTAL CHILD SUPPORT

## COLLECTIONS, SELECTED FISCAL YEARS 1979-93

[In thousands of  
dollars]

State					1979	1983
1987	1990	1991	1992	1993		
Alabama.....					6,854	8,643
39,976	66,174	80,952	98,141	113,273		
Alaska.....					3,844	9,704
17,139	26,788	30,721	35,613	39,148		
Arizona.....					6,411	10,563
20,114	27,837	33,277	46,447	66,580		
Arkansas.....					3,921	7,401
16,267	26,010	32,783	42,065	49,147		
California.....					199,945	254,586
394,882	522,646	591,243	653,681	736,855		
Colorado.....					4,020	17,178
22,376	39,601	46,997	58,030	67,723		
Connecticut.....					23,033	39,227
57,182	66,724	75,778	84,190	93,454		
Delaware.....					5,814	8,097
13,871	20,161	22,692	25,926	26,663		
District of Columbia.....					1,086	3,521
5,690	13,598	16,578	19,733	21,798		
Florida.....					10,524	19,080
81,759	176,603	214,153	252,473	289,976		
Georgia.....					5,554	13,439
48,082	113,095	143,014	174,467	205,566		
Guam.....					160	391
627	1,440	3,162	4,697	5,003		
Hawaii.....					5,150	10,087
15,985	27,638	30,096	34,404	37,327		
Idaho.....					2,501	4,690
13,490	22,909	23,442	27,846	32,127		
Illinois.....					10,740	32,025
89,622	136,019	150,134	183,308	183,889		
Indiana.....					9,073	20,789
60,613	96,145	110,117	124,614	141,164		

Iowa.....				13,017	29,185
48,516	70,982	80,693	96,046	109,278	
Kansas.....				3,975	9,921
22,199	44,958	54,832	66,053	59,601	
Kentucky.....				4,881	19,702
32,456	59,998	73,928	93,902	103,587	
Louisiana.....				12,678	26,754
40,047	60,527	67,988	84,373	103,054	
Maine.....				4,574	10,235
22,421	35,741	36,554	38,005	44,963	
Maryland.....				20,856	77,129
97,889	151,352	163,626	194,009	219,085	
Massachusetts.....				36,338	72,319
128,809	176,915	169,545	185,086	195,374	
Michigan.....				248,414	273,799
531,137	644,734	697,634	782,804	874,483	
Minnesota.....				21,370	44,893
79,467	139,345	160,363	189,495	214,480	
Mississippi.....				1,662	4,887
15,444	30,532	40,277	48,289	53,505	
Missouri.....				5,829	18,118
71,905	129,851	141,372	166,339	189,161	
Montana.....				1,213	2,415
5,328	8,822	12,968	17,436	20,150	
Nebraska.....				2,468	20,044
37,667	52,378	57,055	66,177	71,708	
Nevada.....				3,487	5,556
9,844	16,210	23,346	32,080	37,641	
New Hampshire.....				2,089	11,621
17,542	20,604	22,659	27,360	31,497	
New Jersey.....				94,005	143,225
245,697	281,923	326,879	372,506	407,849	
New Mexico.....				1,680	4,614
8,672	14,416	16,792	19,088	27,117	
New York.....				136,361	174,454
269,218	373,718	437,371	487,738	536,374	
North Carolina.....				9,168	30,830
69,768	120,344	140,222	167,894	197,254	
North Dakota.....				1,723	2,723
5,483	10,414	12,309	15,599	18,693	
Ohio.....				22,832	34,862

180,696	489,515	552,649	665,999	714,132	
Oklahoma.....				1,826	5,233
16,365	32,169	39,922	46,540	52,170	
Oregon.....				88,502	38,052
53,470	78,374	91,252	107,435	124,929	
Pennsylvania.....				186,718	285,829
459,950	614,222	699,676	775,782	814,480	
Puerto Rico.....				1,916	31,985
66,164	74,535	77,252	84,329	97,357	
Rhode Island.....				3,575	7,196
11,823	20,044	21,609	24,880	26,671	
South Carolina.....				3,545	7,461
33,581	52,320	58,857	68,798	79,280	
South Dakota.....				1,407	2,847
6,275	11,024	13,119	15,881	18,112	
Tennessee.....				8,976	19,077
38,406	71,502	77,032	84,818	116,152	
Texas.....				8,207	17,941
61,184	132,318	192,797	251,157	309,502	
Utah.....				6,624	13,594
24,766	38,071	43,895	52,610	56,199	
Vermont.....				1,449	2,828
5,682	9,353	11,023	13,518	15,831	
Virgin Islands.....				260	684
3,018	3,131	3,338	4,049	4,992	
Virginia.....				9,197	13,617
58,859	110,560	129,919	145,114	151,919	
Washington.....				27,018	41,643
72,320	175,750	222,409	267,455	307,251	
West Virginia.....				1,592	3,434
9,724	21,658	23,527	35,561	49,016	
Wisconsin.....				34,267	56,041
154,701	241,272	276,712	293,460	332,814	
Wyoming.....				520	1,017
3,229	7,155	9,079	11,220	13,810	

-----  
 -----  
 Nationwide

total.....				1,332,847	2,024,184
3,917,399	6,010,125	6,885,619	7,964,522	8,909,166	

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement.

TABLE 11-15.--TOTAL AFDC COLLECTIONS,  
SELECTED FISCAL YEARS 1979-93

[In thousands  
of dollars]

	State				1979	1983
1987	1990	1991	1992	1993		
Alabama.....				6,830	7,789	
15,050	19,484	22,788	23,001	22,539		
Alaska.....				334	1,780	
4,242	8,160	9,940	11,145	11,722		
Arizona.....				642	1,459	
4,805	6,102	7,401	12,693	18,616		
Arkansas.....				2,428	4,593	
8,771	11,799	13,800	15,766	16,249		
California.....				117,532	136,963	
198,152	248,440	286,261	314,232	335,235		
Colorado.....				3,525	9,330	
11,155	16,765	19,281	23,287	26,197		
Connecticut.....				11,416	20,628	
26,403	27,405	33,816	37,744	41,292		
Delaware.....				1,386	2,276	
4,150	5,826	6,661	7,306	7,798		
District of Columbia.....				907	2,421	
2,912	4,118	4,407	4,927	5,197		
Florida.....				8,598	10,408	
33,511	48,364	57,071	69,765	78,081		
Georgia.....				4,772	11,355	
25,244	45,937	57,765	74,546	84,627		
Guam.....				159	259	
299	520	1,635	2,524	2,344		
Hawaii.....				2,544	4,482	
5,698	8,343	7,699	8,161	9,058		



Idaho.....				2,047	3,806
5,034	6,952	7,482	8,543	8,746	
Illinois.....				9,916	18,971
38,705	44,149	48,968	58,842	55,749	
Indiana.....				8,116	17,646
31,466	38,124	45,030	49,247	52,040	
Iowa.....				10,654	19,978
27,834	28,552	30,585	35,401	36,775	
Kansas.....				3,454	7,807
12,155	15,209	17,454	20,869	22,402	
Kentucky.....				4,615	6,316
11,676	22,286	27,502	34,702	36,565	
Louisiana.....				5,244	9,641
15,798	20,861	23,089	25,975	26,827	
Maine.....				4,133	8,402
15,557	21,089	21,063	21,477	25,683	
Maryland.....				10,929	27,773
27,417	42,318	37,162	46,348	51,313	
Massachusetts.....				29,145	40,476
53,962	68,968	66,969	71,784	77,292	
Michigan.....				76,375	97,694
127,508	145,251	153,690	168,317	169,581	
Minnesota.....				14,510	25,708
35,822	43,950	47,802	53,305	55,961	
Mississippi.....				1,556	4,544
7,596	14,530	19,494	21,523	21,641	
Missouri.....				4,165	11,500
23,525	38,056	37,021	49,653	51,153	
Montana.....				685	1,834
3,365	4,394	5,251	6,413	6,464	
Nebraska.....				2,083	3,675
6,160	6,990	7,431	9,195	9,797	
Nevada.....				517	1,824
2,673	3,311	4,465	6,807	7,021	
New Hampshire.....				2,089	2,649
2,744	3,606	4,385	6,337	7,638	
New Jersey.....				28,622	41,103
58,890	61,473	76,644	83,509	84,020	
New Mexico.....				1,160	2,891
4,120	5,573	6,421	7,850	12,922	
New York.....				56,588	68,622

102,115	134,040	157,582	174,587	184,583	
North Carolina.....				7,714	18,795
33,249	46,176	54,712	64,004	70,304	
North Dakota.....				1,379	2,011
3,517	5,103	5,600	6,016	6,098	
Ohio.....				21,974	33,403
66,866	76,888	84,304	100,833	105,719	
Oklahoma.....				1,260	3,648
7,143	11,875	14,894	17,682	18,784	
Oregon.....				12,977	12,645
14,744	18,877	21,989	25,637	28,357	
Pennsylvania.....				33,190	47,135
77,932	96,328	113,735	123,784	124,490	
Puerto Rico.....				439	917
1,803	1,707	1,600	1,428	1,344	
Rhode Island.....				3,438	4,217
6,064	10,168	10,550	13,486	14,954	
South Carolina.....				3,065	6,015
13,218	15,933	17,779	21,066	24,588	
South Dakota.....				1,137	2,175
3,058	3,717	4,213	4,888	5,056	
Tennessee.....				3,871	5,567
12,086	22,926	27,865	22,777	33,422	
Texas.....				6,370	10,879
19,703	39,659	47,255	59,165	66,199	
Utah.....				5,442	11,643
11,733	14,999	16,261	18,939	19,488	
Vermont.....				1,201	2,626
4,079	5,578	6,380	6,649	7,638	
Virgin Islands.....				143	140
241	210	233	282	343	
Virginia.....				9,081	11,758
15,536	27,770	33,910	38,281	39,610	
Washington.....				18,319	26,495
38,429	65,291	77,402	91,083	100,337	
West Virginia.....				1,430	3,311
5,647	4,085	6,859	9,500	16,867	
Wisconsin.....				26,044	39,582
57,468	59,303	61,179	63,813	65,439	
Wyoming.....				379	790
1,489	2,584	3,226	3,749	4,345	

Nationwide total.....	596,532	879,862
1,348,520 1,750,125 1,983,962 2,258,844 2,416,511		

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement.

TABLE 11-16.--TOTAL NON-AFDC COLLECTIONS,  
SELECTED FISCAL YEARS 1979-93

[In thousands  
of dollars]

	State	1979	1983
1987	1990	1991	1992
1993			
Alabama.....	16	854	
24,926	46,691	58,165	75,140
			\$90,733
Alaska.....	3,510	7,924	
12,897	18,628	20,781	24,468
			27,426
Arizona.....	5,769	9,104	
15,309	21,735	25,875	33,754
			47,963
Arkansas.....	1,494	2,808	
7,496	14,211	18,984	26,299
			32,899
California.....	82,412	117,623	
196,730	274,205	304,982	339,449
			401,620
Colorado.....	496	7,848	
11,221	22,836	27,715	34,743
			41,527
Connecticut.....	11,617	18,599	
30,779	39,319	41,960	46,445
			52,161
Delaware.....	4,428	5,821	
9,721	14,335	16,032	18,620
			18,865
District of Columbia.....	179	1,100	
2,778	9,481	12,171	14,806
			16,601
Florida.....	1,926	8,672	
48,248	128,239	157,081	182,707
			211,896
Georgia.....	783	2,084	

22,838	67,158	85,249	99,921	120,939	
Guam.....				(\1\)	131
327	920	1,527	2,172	2,659	
Hawaii.....				2,606	5,605
10,287	19,295	22,397	26,243	28,269	
Idaho.....				454	884
8,457	15,957	15,960	19,302	23,381	
Illinois.....				823	13,054
50,917	91,870	101,167	124,467	128,140	
Indiana.....				957	3,142
29,147	58,021	65,087	75,368	89,125	
Iowa.....				2,363	9,701
20,682	42,430	50,109	60,645	72,503	
Kansas.....				520	2,114
10,044	29,749	37,379	45,183	37,199	
Kentucky.....				266	13,387
20,780	37,711	46,426	59,200	67,022	
Louisiana.....				7,434	16,113
24,250	39,665	44,898	58,398	76,227	
Maine.....				441	1,833
6,864	14,652	15,490	16,528	19,280	
Maryland.....				9,927	49,356
70,473	109,034	126,464	147,660	167,771	
Massachusetts.....				7,193	31,844
74,846	107,948	102,576	113,302	118,082	
Michigan.....				172,039	176,105
403,629	499,483	543,944	614,488	704,903	
Minnesota.....				6,861	19,184
43,645	95,395	112,561	136,190	158,519	
Mississippi.....				106	343
7,848	16,002	20,783	26,766	31,864	
Missouri.....				1,664	6,618
48,380	91,795	104,351	116,686	138,008	
Montana.....				528	582
1,963	4,427	7,718	11,024	13,686	
Nebraska.....				385	16,369
31,507	45,387	49,624	56,983	61,911	
Nevada.....				2,970	3,731
7,172	12,899	18,881	25,273	30,620	
New Hampshire.....				0	8,972
14,798	16,999	18,274	21,023	23,859	

New Jersey.....	65,383	102,122
186,808	220,450	250,235
288,997	323,829	
New Mexico.....	520	1,722
4,552	8,843	10,371
11,239	14,195	
New York.....	79,773	105,831
167,103	239,678	279,289
313,151	351,791	
North Carolina.....	1,454	12,035
36,519	74,167	85,510
103,890	126,951	
North Dakota.....	344	712
1,966	5,312	6,708
9,583	12,595	
Ohio.....	858	1,459
113,830	412,627	468,346
565,166	608,413	
Oklahoma.....	566	1,585
9,222	20,293	25,028
28,858	33,386	
Oregon.....	75,525	25,406
38,726	59,497	69,263
81,798	96,572	
Pennsylvania.....	153,528	238,694
382,018	517,893	517,893
651,998	689,990	
Puerto Rico.....	1,477	31,068
64,360	72,828	75,652
82,901	96,014	
Rhode Island.....	137	2,979
5,759	9,876	11,059
11,394	11,717	
South Carolina.....	480	1,446
20,363	36,387	41,078
47,732	54,692	
South Dakota.....	270	672
3,217	7,307	8,906
10,993	13,056	
Tennessee.....	5,105	13,510
26,321	48,575	49,167
62,041	82,730	
Texas.....	1,837	7,062
41,481	92,659	145,543
191,993	243,303	
Utah.....	1,183	1,952
13,032	23,073	27,634
33,671	36,712	
Vermont.....	249	202
1,603	3,775	4,643
6,869	8,193	
Virgin Islands.....	116	544
2,777	2,920	3,105
3,767	4,649	
Virginia.....	116	1,858
43,323	82,789	96,008
106,833	112,309	
Washington.....	8,699	15,148
33,891	110,459	145,006
176,372	206,914	
West Virginia.....	162	123

4,076	17,574	16,668	26,061	32,149	
Wisconsin.....				8,224	16,459
97,233	181,969	215,533	229,647	267,374	
Wyoming.....				141	227
1,739	4,571	5,853	7,471	9,465	

Nationwide total.....				736,315	1,144,322
2,568,880	4,260,000	4,901,657	5,705,678	6,492,655	

\1\Less than \$500.

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement.

TABLE 11-17.--AVERAGE NUMBER OF AFDC CHILD SUPPORT  
ENFORCEMENT CASES IN WHICH A COLLECTION WAS MADE,  
SELECTED FISCAL  
YEARS 1978-93

	State		1978		1983		1985
1987	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993		
Total.....			458,439		594,679		684,114
608,986	657,585	700,803	755,328	831,172	872,579		

Alabama.....			7,966		16,301		9,133
11,572	12,316	10,860	8,347	9,209	9,077		
Alaska.....			246		1,154		1,120
1,038	1,213	1,387	1,718	1,949	2,168		
Arizona.....			819		1,164		1,851
1,470	2,545	3,128	1,930	2,822	3,343		
Arkansas.....			2,509		3,683		5,207
5,506	6,278	6,372	7,071	8,188	8,301		
California.....			92,325		86,277		103,742

74,081	84,367	89,304	104,903	116,118	123,776
Colorado.....			3,177	4,129	5,687
4,092	4,771	4,437	4,581	5,126	5,210
Connecticut.....			8,002	13,591	15,565
13,337	7,470	6,578	7,128	8,445	9,437
Delaware.....			1,156	2,254	2,891
2,858	2,111	2,223	2,495	2,663	2,913
District of Columbia..			708	1,508	1,925
2,138	2,553	1,758	1,940	2,281	2,437
Florida.....			7,376	11,856	16,468
30,114	34,883	38,500	40,687	40,135	44,727
Georgia.....			6,350	7,826	6,657
10,710	14,833	19,310	23,280	24,729	26,676
Guam.....			(\1\)	186	206
197	182	339	573	616	683
Hawaii.....			1,757	2,718	4,622
3,175	3,831	2,658	2,773	4,651	4,551
Idaho.....			1,346	936	4,343
1,245	1,522	1,752	1,992	2,356	2,719
Illinois.....			9,624	15,551	18,299
14,352	14,986	16,968	23,511	23,639	26,028
Indiana.....			9,488	19,514	22,058
16,188	17,716	20,444	26,344	30,823	31,159
Iowa.....			8,396	10,135	11,871
7,015	7,241	7,289	7,153	7,681	7,365
Kansas.....			2,859	4,205	4,769
3,798	3,565	4,595	5,268	6,120	6,857
Kentucky.....			3,083	4,601	6,729
6,853	8,699	10,741	12,513	13,516	15,217
Louisiana.....			5,204	6,944	7,836
9,916	11,582	11,842	12,198	12,510	12,164
Maine.....			2,368	6,141	7,178
4,734	5,200	5,515	5,767	5,287	7,013
Maryland.....			14,002	15,576	15,861
9,073	5,250	9,237	18,330	19,366	18,684
Massachusetts.....			17,782	22,655	25,350
17,211	16,610	16,029	16,106	17,961	18,378
Michigan.....			61,985	73,442	59,049
58,364	47,388	51,747	46,647	45,112	45,211
Minnesota.....			9,818	12,891	14,872
12,442	13,822	14,192	12,658	14,563	16,440

Mississippi.....	1,846	3,216	3,742
4,544      6,410      7,237	8,808	9,604	10,157
Missouri.....	(\2\)	2,465	7,716
6,483      9,894      11,178	11,241	13,430	14,135
Montana.....	748	1,178	1,600
849      1,086      1,140	1,298	1,551	1,816
Nebraska.....	1,509	1,841	2,362
2,555      2,666      2,811	3,255	4,802	4,811
Nevada.....	494	2,261	2,370
1,645      1,917      2,269	2,404	3,096	3,506
New Hampshire.....	1,530	1,512	1,021
981      988      1,091	1,454	2,240	2,703
New Jersey.....	16,243	24,712	27,686
25,182      18,415      17,591	19,728	24,376	26,241
New Mexico.....	1,429	2,027	2,034
2,175      3,147      3,766	4,383	3,865	4,385
New York.....	36,287	44,168	48,979
30,993      36,695      40,219	46,382	51,290	51,407
North Carolina.....	11,232	12,089	14,216
17,089      19,157      20,381	24,699	28,028	29,649
North Dakota.....	759	1,193	1,656
1,130      1,338      1,647	1,665	1,597	1,579
Ohio.....	24,419	28,064	32,582
35,273      40,308      35,973	34,446	38,445	39,857
Oklahoma.....	1,101	2,487	3,543
1,468      6,605      7,787	3,895	4,794	5,294
Oregon.....	6,761	4,020	6,687
5,935      5,829      6,437	7,437	8,321	9,495
Pennsylvania.....	15,172	35,405	42,088
49,100      45,772      47,039	52,269	59,514	61,998
Puerto Rico.....	413	2,281	3,736
3,588      3,991      3,696	3,103	3,026	2,811
Rhode Island.....	2,419	2,441	3,233
3,092      4,141      4,295	3,100	3,346	4,070
South Carolina.....	3,343	4,182	5,785
10,495      13,954      14,614	15,349	16,764	19,026
South Dakota.....	1,087	1,223	1,532
1,887      1,744      1,234	1,262	1,526	1,642
Tennessee.....	4,705	6,642	8,336
9,430      13,114      16,659	11,625	12,179	11,391
Texas.....	5,446	4,099	5,652



9,167	13,509	15,447	18,229	20,387	23,075
Utah.....			3,784	5,346	5,209
3,627	3,652	3,333	3,669	3,973	4,033
Vermont.....			953	2,223	2,329
1,984	2,462	2,596	2,826	3,556	4,114
Virgin Islands.....			232	82	199
220	184	133	135	165	193
Virginia.....			4,729	13,554	13,054
10,813	11,854	14,138	16,761	18,679	19,399
Washington.....			14,860	14,160	15,895
18,110	22,921	27,063	23,263	28,618	27,020
West Virginia.....			1,430	2,044	2,331
2,107	2,426	2,484	2,622	3,347	4,108
Wisconsin.....			16,868	26,106	44,799
26,847	31,438	30,143	30,426	32,693	31,984
Wyoming.....			294	420	453
738	1,034	1,197	1,681	2,094	2,146

-----  
 -----  
 \1\Data not reported for this item or insufficient data  
 reported to perform indicated computation.  
 \2\Less than \$500.

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement.

TABLE 11-18.--AVERAGE NUMBER OF NON-AFDC CHILD SUPPORT  
 ENFORCEMENT CASES IN WHICH A COLLECTION WAS MADE, SELECTED  
 FISCAL YEARS 1978-93

----- ----- -----					
State					
1978	1983	1985	1987	1989	1990
1991	1992	1993			

----- ----- -----					
Total.....					
248,590	507,031	653,803	934,177	1,247,228	
1,362,821	1,554,740	1,749,427	1,953,580		

```

-----
-----
Alabama.....
110      221      5,023      11,583      16,602      19,971
28,512      33,741      39,586
Alaska.....
2,309      3,035      3,205      3,184      3,637      3,947
4,211      4,598      4,997
Arizona.....
(\1\)      5,525      4,770      4,668      6,740      7,333
9,144      11,107      10,283
Arkansas.....
764      2,803      3,613      5,074      7,241      8,473
11,232      15,088      18,449
California.....
69,696      66,164      64,686      77,448      91,029
96,101      101,913      97,597      104,864
Colorado.....
1,017      3,647      3,976      4,537      6,054      7,281
9,008      10,492      11,360
Connecticut.....
(\1\)      7,826      9,392      9,884      10,606      11,289
13,289      14,441      15,721
Delaware.....
3,210      3,611      4,395      5,073      6,380      6,770
8,058      8,303      9,191
District of Columbia.....
93      478      1,007      1,264      2,653      4,252
4,964      5,704      6,278
Florida.....
1,200      8,002      7,593      25,573      50,995      56,329
66,748      67,948      77,734
Georgia.....
1,207      4,091      5,487      14,883      24,992      30,217
34,545      35,419      40,698
Guam.....
(\1\)      63      65      114      207      378
495      616      803
Hawaii.....
(\1\)      308      352      2,804      6,682      8,103

```

10,398	15,305	16,299			
Idaho.....					
455	591	1,047	2,529	5,540	6,493
7,403	8,689	9,889			
Illinois.....					
196	6,433	10,030	14,479	21,781	26,184
36,363	36,246	40,744			
Indiana.....					
450	1,784	2,881	12,759	17,990	25,586
27,111	34,855	36,865			
Iowa.....					
671	4,192	4,913	3,441	10,807	12,400
14,103	16,352	19,266			
Kansas.....					
210	1,449	758	5,260	9,308	11,520
13,855	16,003	18,846			
Kentucky.....					
255	3,657	3,647	15,549	13,686	17,473
20,489	23,531	28,950			
Louisiana.....					
6,866	9,517	10,636	11,695	14,883	16,739
20,001	24,194	28,146			
Maine.....					
638	296	1,496	3,862	5,774	6,425
6,510	5,479	7,630			
Maryland.....					
130	27,384	26,154	12,685	15,969	27,339
49,380	52,024	54,989			
Massachusetts.....					
(\1\)	0	0	26,549	27,950	22,921
14,264	24,605	25,899			
Michigan.....					
(\1\)	51,304	88,675	126,187	120,969	115,081
129,461	133,652	141,489			
Minnesota.....					
2,766	10,263	12,615	16,137	23,502	26,712
27,174	35,791	43,272			
Mississippi.....					
81	320	1,319	4,348	6,937	7,917
10,077	12,997	16,007			
Missouri.....					

(\1\)	1,631	5,362	14,676	22,802	26,994
32,317	38,492	41,022			
Montana.....					
444	348	344	800	1,012	1,448
2,208	2,748	3,750			
Nebraska.....					
176	4,942	7,874	10,540	13,464	14,748
14,883	15,185	17,771			
Nevada.....					
4,026	4,084	5,360	3,212	4,085	4,451
5,327	6,676	7,819			
New Hampshire.....					
(\1\)	5,433	4,939	5,474	5,809	5,260
5,875	7,077	7,870			
New Jersey.....					
20,000	38,557	45,868	51,706	65,947	
66,885	68,753	78,789	84,267		
New Mexico.....					
286	1,806	2,249	2,462	4,490	5,360
5,758	5,947	5,849			
New York.....					
39,623	54,296	63,829	67,460	78,638	
83,651	94,031	103,924	108,419		
North Carolina.....					
1,715	5,910	10,137	15,323	22,584	27,632
31,810	37,172	43,884			
North Dakota.....					
154	171	266	865	1,427	1,911
2,357	3,320	4,026			
Ohio.....					
1,430	4,594	10,853	39,114	100,069	101,553
107,806	135,535	149,104			
Oklahoma.....					
(\1\)	1,269	1,968	4,867	8,635	10,509
8,558	8,479	10,707			
Oregon.....					
17,957	16,262	19,331	20,620	23,747	
25,657	19,754	21,810	25,063		
Pennsylvania.....					
49,621	92,084	108,498	123,248	140,750	
147,885	171,525	182,098	190,671		

Puerto Rico.....					
710	17,908	26,873	30,490	35,346	35,295
36,731	33,075	41,130			
Rhode Island.....					
57	1,407	1,969	2,750	3,559	3,705
3,017	3,060	3,291			
South Carolina.....					
203	1,198	2,777	3,165	4,671	4,896
10,393	25,764	27,771			
South Dakota.....					
297	512	502	2,175	3,154	2,739
3,262	3,881	4,607			
Tennessee.....					
6,360	10,271	12,156	14,957	21,649	28,174
31,554	35,358	40,003			
Texas.....					
2,861	4,224	8,833	15,079	26,643	37,741
51,039	65,152	79,037			
Utah.....					
400	698	1,068	4,008	5,437	6,738
8,605	9,704	10,573			
Vermont.....					
181	194	393	967	1,459	1,659
1,870	2,433	3,154			
Virgin Islands.....					
1	262	1,288	1,252	1,499	1,247
1,301	1,348	1,538			
Virginia.....					
38	1,554	876	19,273	26,638	31,492
34,242	38,267	46,760			
Washington.....					
4,822	7,422	9,802	13,656	24,331	34,791
46,930	55,788	64,929			
West Virginia.....					
130	186	288	1,953	5,246	8,045
7,555	9,513	11,971			
Wisconsin.....					
4,685	6,719	20,288	41,953	63,554	56,769
65,718	70,780	88,601			
Wyoming.....					
89	125	77	563	1,669	2,352

2,853            3,275            1,738

\1\Data not reported for this item or insufficient data  
reported to perform indicated computation.

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement.

TABLE 11-19.--SUPPORT ORDERS ESTABLISHED, ENFORCED, AND  
MODIFIED TO INCLUDE HEALTH INSURANCE, FISCAL YEAR

1993

Total

Total            number

Total	Percent	number of	enforced	Percent
number	with	orders	or	number of
with	health	State	modified	orders
health	insurance	enforced	with	established
insurance		or	health	insurance
		modified		

insurance

Alabama.....					13,671
3,127	22.87	296,358	5,351	1.81	
Alaska.....					1,259
1,217	96.66	1,207	870	72.08	
Arizona.....					3,898
3,405	87.35	156,764	10,789	6.88	
Arkansas.....					6,954
5,811	83.56	4,702	3,990	84.86	

California.....					104,092
80,317	77.16	594,850	363,218	61.06	
Colorado.....					7,355
5,735	77.97	29,463	14,497	49.20	
Connecticut.....					20,448
10,001	48.91	104,204	37,691	36.17	
Delaware.....					1,634
1,632	99.88	3,693	3,682	99.70	
District of Columbia.....					1,428
660	46.22	4,510	NA	0	
Florida.....					11,892
NA	0	46,388	NA	0	
Georgia.....					33,303
33,303	100.00	474,018	9,581	2.02	
Guam.....					380
358	94.21	578	499	86.33	
Hawaii.....					2,553
2,553	100.00	1,060	1,060	100.00	
Idaho.....					2,630
2,630	100.00	69,399	6,246	9.00	
Illinois.....					21,479
7,548	35.14	7,770	2,124	27.34	
Indiana.....					34,882
NA	0	NA	NA	0	
Iowa.....					10,345
8,903	86.06	228,412	77,990	34.14	
Kansas.....					6,627
6,053	91.34	117,887	32,802	27.82	
Kentucky.....					36,589
3,564	9.74	43,530	128	0.29	
Louisiana.....					17,345
16,649	95.99	103,682	59,051	56.95	
Maine.....					4,243
2,528	59.58	10,080	1,096	10.87	
Maryland.....					17,139
13,416	78.28	69,111	10,715	15.50	
Massachusetts.....					12,106
6,077	50.20	13,102	6,349	48.46	
Michigan.....					36,121
36,121	100.00	925,860	39,269	4.24	
Minnesota.....					15,966

11,948	74.83	32,975	23,533	71.37	
Mississippi.....					8,726
NA	0	7,779	NA	0	
Missouri.....					24,647
16,926	68.67	86,297	38,578	44.70	
Montana.....					20,438
288	1.41	6,187	3,601	58.20	
Nebraska.....					3,728
836	22.42	855	150	17.54	
Nevada.....					4,189
2,259	53.93	36,363	1,393	3.83	
New Hampshire.....					2,759
4,024	145.85	14,420	1,238	8.59	
New Jersey.....					28,064
14,425	51.40	194,291	23,189	11.94	
New Mexico.....					4,377
3,025	69.11	1,294	843	65.16	
New York.....					34,433
13,770	39.99	42,884	17,151	39.99	
North Carolina.....					33,313
21,730	66.23	9,200	1,868	20.30	
North Dakota.....					1,608
1,483	92.23	2,186	108	4.94	
Ohio.....					38,166
19,329	50.64	232,759	47,212	20.28	
Oklahoma.....					7,541
4,195	55.63	7,333	1,403	19.13	
Oregon.....					13,049
10,659	81.68	51,173	19,086	37.30	
Pennsylvania.....					105,333
59,590	56.57	369,348	165,558	44.82	
Puerto Rico.....					13,716
NA	0	1,941	91	4.69	
Rhode Island.....					2,820
1,604	56.88	9,910	4,080	41.17	
South Carolina.....					10,439
7,837	75.07	22,068	14,900	67.52	
South Dakota.....					1,533
1,449	94.52	10,764	8,876	82.48	
Tennessee.....					98,464
3,296	3.35	32,843	11,183	34.05	



Texas.....					34,463
34,483	100.00	64,537	18,258	28.29	
Utah.....					7,080
5,376	75.93	204,877	128,339	62.64	
Vermont.....					1,124
1,124	100.00	3,969	3,969	100.00	
Virgin Islands.....					412
157	38.11	1,049	329	31.35	
Virginia.....					41,496
17,887	43.11	68,550	15,321	22.36	
Washington.....					35,897
26,374	73.47	467,001	306,612	65.66	
West Virginia.....					2,568
2,428	94.55	4,561	1,442	31.62	
Wisconsin.....					28,378
9,095	32.05	88,485	49,526	55.97	
Wyoming.....					4,583
3,178	69.34	4,333	322	7.43	

-----

-----

Nationwide totals.....					1,037,683
550,363	53.04	5,386,860	1,595,157	29.61	

-----

-----

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement.

TABLE 11-20.--PERCENTAGE OF AFDC ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS  
RECOVERED THROUGH CHILD SUPPORT COLLECTIONS, SELECTED  
FISCAL YEARS

1979-93

-----

-----

	State		1979	1985	1987
1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	
Total.....			5.8	7.3	9.1
10.0	10.3	10.7	11.4	12.0	

-----

Alabama.....	8.5	21.0	23.2
30.8          31.7          33.7	27.0	23.8	
Alaska.....	1.5	4.6	8.3
12.6          13.7          14.6	12.7	11.9	
Arizona.....	2.0	2.5	5.1
3.8          4.4          4.2	5.4	7.1	
Arkansas.....	4.8	15.2	17.6
21.0          20.7          23.6	26.5	28.0	
California.....	6.5	4.5	6.1
6.0          5.9          6.3	6.5	7.1	
Colorado.....	4.8	9.3	9.5
11.4          12.3          13.0	15.0	16.7	
Connecticut.....	6.5	10.1	12.2
12.7          9.5          10.2	10.5	11.2	
Delaware.....	4.4	14.6	17.3
21.2          20.3          20.6	19.7	19.8	
District of Columbia....	1.0	3.3	3.8
4.7          4.9          4.5	4.7	4.6	
Florida.....	5.5	10.0	11.5
11.9          11.6          11.1	9.9	9.6	
Georgia.....	4.3	9.8	10.4
12.4          14.3          15.4	18.2	20.1	
Guam.....	5.3	6.4	9.1
11.9          10.8          32.7	34.6	28.7	
Hawaii.....	2.9	6.6	8.9
7.3          8.8          7.4	6.9	6.7	
Idaho.....	8.9	22.6	25.0
33.2          35.7          34.7	36.5	35.3	
Illinois.....	1.5	3.2	4.8
5.0          5.6          5.7	7.0	6.6	
Indiana.....	7.2	16.1	21.5
23.0          22.4          23.8	24.0	24.5	
Iowa.....	9.0	15.0	19.3
19.2          20.1          20.6	23.2	24.3	
Kansas.....	5.0	11.6	14.1
13.4          15.9          17.8	19.4	19.7	
Kentucky.....	3.8	6.8	8.5
12.0          12.4          15.0	18.8	20.0	
Louisiana.....	5.2	8.4	9.1

10.5	11.1	12.4	14.2	15.3	
Maine.....			7.3	13.4	20.6
26.1	22.9	21.5	18.8	24.5	
Maryland.....			6.1	11.6	11.2
13.0	14.5	11.4	14.2	16.9	
Massachusetts.....			6.6	11.3	10.7
12.0	11.8	10.4	10.5	11.4	
Michigan.....			9.0	9.7	12.5
13.0	13.9	15.1	15.7	16.6	
Minnesota.....			7.8	10.5	12.7
14.2	14.4	14.6	16.3	17.3	
Mississippi.....			2.9	7.9	9.4
13.7	16.8	22.3	24.2	24.9	
Missouri.....			2.8	9.6	12.0
15.0	17.8	15.6	19.0	18.9	
Montana.....			4.4	10.7	8.6
9.9	11.1	12.9	16.0	15.0	
Nebraska.....			5.4	10.0	11.5
12.9	13.0	13.2	16.0	16.9	
Nevada.....			6.3	14.9	16.4
12.4	12.2	14.1	17.1	16.6	
New Hampshire.....			9.4	12.4	15.2
12.4	11.3	10.1	12.3	14.4	
New Jersey.....			5.9	9.7	12.5
14.4	14.0	16.4	16.5	16.4	
New Mexico.....			3.4	7.3	7.4
9.4	9.2	7.8	8.0	11.6	
New York.....			3.5	4.0	5.0
5.6	6.4	6.7	7.2	7.0	
North Carolina.....			5.6	15.0	17.4
18.9	18.8	18.4	19.6	20.5	
North Dakota.....			9.6	14.7	16.8
17.4	21.0	23.4	24.0	24.1	
Ohio.....			4.8	6.2	10.1
9.9	10.0	10.3	11.7	12.2	
Oklahoma.....			1.6	7.5	6.4
8.0	9.0	9.9	10.7	11.1	
Oregon.....			9.0	13.3	13.0
13.0	13.5	13.5	12.5	13.4	
Pennsylvania.....			4.6	8.4	11.0
13.2	12.6	13.7	14.0	13.7	

Puerto Rico.....	.7	2.4	2.7
2.3            2.4            2.1	1.8	1.7	
Rhode Island.....	6.1	7.0	7.6
8.9            10.4            9.2	10.8	11.6	
South Carolina.....	5.4	8.6	13.1
15.9            16.8            16.8	17.9	21.1	
South Dakota.....	6.5	12.9	14.4
17.9            17.1            18.1	18.8	19.5	
Tennessee.....	5.0	6.5	10.3
14.1            13.7            14.3	11.2	15.7	
Texas.....	5.4	6.9	6.2
9.4            9.5            10.2	11.8	12.9	
Utah.....	13.7	22.7	19.6
22.1            23.4            23.2	25.6	26.2	
Vermont.....	4.1	8.4	11.1
13.4            12.7            13.0	12.7	14.7	
Virgin Islands.....	8.5	7.6	8.3
7.9            7.3            7.1	8.5	10.2	
Virginia.....	6.3	8.3	9.0
13.5            15.7            17.2	17.3	17.3	
Washington.....	12.5	9.8	10.9
14.4            17.1            18.1	20.0	20.8	
West Virginia.....	2.6	5.1	7.8
6.1            5.1            8.1	10.6	18.2	
Wisconsin.....	9.5	8.8	12.4
15.4            15.5            15.7	16.2	17.0	
Wyoming.....	5.6	5.5	8.2
10.0            13.5            13.3	14.3	17.0	

-----  
 -----  
 Note: Payments to AFDC Unemployed Parent (UP) families have been excluded from the maintenance assistance payments totals in those States having AFDC-UP programs.

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement.

TABLE 11-21.--FEDERAL INCOME TAX REFUND OFFSET  
 PROGRAM COLLECTIONS, FISCAL YEARS 1983-93

[In thousands of dollars]

-----					
-----					
	State			1983	1985
1987	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993
-----					
Alabama.....				1,555	3,208
5,135	7,450	8,009	8,827	20,586	17,321
Alaska.....				212	364
891	995	1,208	1,387	1,711	1,357
Arizona.....				385	1,062
2,049	2,592	2,605	2,876	4,007	8,049
Arkansas.....				1,104	1,886
3,770	4,490	4,669	5,575	7,106	6,631
California.....				35,034	34,926
46,287	50,472	57,624	57,098	67,569	60,173
Colorado.....				3,016	2,393
3,020	4,947	5,604	6,179	7,614	7,430
Connecticut.....				4,455	4,224
6,140	12,132	9,907	9,250	10,190	8,863
Delaware.....				166	1,284
1,319	1,812	1,966	2,467	2,683	2,223
District of Columbia.....				567	747
779	1,202	1,942	1,606	1,788	1,646
Florida.....				1,980	3,938
7,318	21,294	21,038	24,880	31,569	29,354
Georgia.....				1,526	3,711
7,258	11,566	13,032	15,693	22,016	21,778
Guam.....				13	14
44	26	13	11	51	42
Hawaii.....				817	846
1,122	1,511	1,573	1,976	2,328	3,496
Idaho.....				1,183	1,204
1,594	1,959	2,173	2,270	2,690	2,473
Illinois.....				4,525	9,019
15,415	13,887	19,307	18,876	26,631	19,924
Indiana.....				4,940	8,975
11,390	15,642	15,860	16,853	21,169	18,882
Iowa.....				5,526	6,784
7,798	8,990	8,828	9,439	11,240	9,941
Kansas.....				2,525	2,905

3,704	4,947	5,300	6,101	7,525	6,782
Kentucky.....				1,165	2,299
3,262	6,812	6,680	7,891	12,919	11,390
Louisiana.....				1,536	2,487
4,722	5,797	6,582	6,519	8,438	9,182
Maine.....				1,844	2,126
3,377	4,866	5,383	4,925	5,477	4,611
Maryland.....				5,688	6,118
9,646	17,039	14,343	14,182	15,542	14,867
Massachusetts.....				3,325	4,225
5,269	10,101	11,899	10,936	13,077	10,841
Michigan.....				18,250	20,013
25,893	30,246	29,854	32,776	44,968	42,748
Minnesota.....				5,576	5,904
6,762	7,936	8,096	8,831	9,904	8,734
Mississippi.....				1,019	1,976
2,252	4,147	4,958	6,392	8,270	8,389
Missouri.....				4,289	4,849
8,482	12,438	14,205	10,189	17,711	15,498
Montana.....				431	858
1,209	1,366	1,301	1,374	1,636	1,597
Nebraska.....				502	1,205
1,395	2,598	2,485	2,548	3,121	3,068
Nevada.....				354	389
433	630	768	1,363	2,449	2,184
New Hampshire.....				757	662
1,284	1,137	1,177	1,350	2,028	1,906
New Jersey.....				9,458	11,449
14,268	16,201	16,171	18,266	20,132	17,253
New Mexico.....				533	1,315
2,278	2,279	2,585	2,863	3,259	2,905
New York.....				9,945	11,996
27,991	23,472	24,763	31,307	33,734	29,445
North Carolina.....				4,235	4,291
7,229	11,359	11,270	12,718	16,410	16,971
North Dakota.....				352	534
848	773	1,302	1,501	1,767	1,586
Ohio.....				2,886	7,229
11,186	14,346	16,514	21,027	27,476	27,305
Oklahoma.....				703	2,179
2,218	4,197	4,647	5,803	7,575	6,752

Oregon.....				3,782	3,567
4,863	5,113	5,381	5,622	6,259	5,364
Pennsylvania.....				6,112	13,550
17,123	21,332	24,354	27,946	32,560	27,636
Puerto Rico.....				2	13
13	47	6	63	231	208
Rhode Island.....				838	775
880	1,401	1,548	1,522	1,799	1,359
South Carolina.....				368	832
1,789	2,788	3,233	3,449	4,678	5,091
South Dakota.....				374	623
998	1,465	1,498	1,648	2,110	1,925
Tennessee.....				642	1,592
3,025	7,110	7,539	8,341	16,033	12,126
Texas.....				3,906	5,928
11,316	17,934	19,926	24,133	34,346	35,816
Utah.....				2,540	2,765
2,991	3,730	4,066	4,297	5,604	5,184
Vermont.....				611	748
887	1,154	1,017	1,074	1,294	1,031
Virgin Islands.....					
37	34	7	25	44	62
Virginia.....				1,674	3,532
6,840	8,913	9,761	10,298	12,594	12,108
Washington.....				4,278	6,201
10,510	12,537	13,732	13,957	17,417	16,447
West Virginia.....				1,038	1,823
2,013	2,944	3,066	3,265	3,705	3,378
Wisconsin.....				6,266	7,973
10,029	12,902	13,290	14,384	17,486	17,117
Wyoming.....				222	280
503	534	684	1,131	1,190	888

-----

Nationwide total.....				175,021	229,798
338,853	443,594	474,748	515,279	661,711	609,336

-----

-----

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement.

TABLE 11-22.--ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENDITURES  
FOR THE CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM, SELECTED FISCAL  
YEARS 1979-93

[In thousands of dollars]

State				
1979	1987	1988	1989	1990
1991	1992	1993		
Alabama.....				
4,633	14,878	17,839	23,101	23,802
30,212	31,572	34,594		
Alaska.....				
2,137	5,625	5,751	5,699	6,464
8,450	9,084	10,559		
Arizona.....				
2,014	9,096	10,052	13,212	18,744
21,675	29,555	37,121		
Arkansas.....				
2,385	5,532	6,870	6,724	9,284
10,931	13,341	15,336		
California.....				
75,579	156,472	160,416	176,209	201,823
225,008	252,868	290,648		
Colorado.....				
3,861	11,806	13,746	15,160	14,043
14,590	21,494	27,450		
Connecticut.....				
5,463	19,682	22,097	24,412	27,135
28,465	28,363	29,288		
Delaware.....				
852	4,519	5,924	6,006	6,448
7,988	9,007	11,133		
District of Columbia.....				
1,652	5,876	5,745	7,116	7,630



8,825	8,455	8,697		
Florida.....				
7,047	41,385	46,094	55,167	66,445
74,947	83,228	76,721		
Georgia.....				
3,238	15,200	22,588	29,030	36,927
39,586	40,954	45,968		
Guam.....				
108	411	465	641	1,163
1,808	2,509	2,652		
Hawaii.....				
1,408	5,157	4,170	5,417	7,598
7,419	8,739	9,837		
Idaho.....				
1,063	3,321	4,320	4,822	5,697
7,309	7,691	9,360		
Illinois.....				
6,930	35,746	39,467	40,719	52,073
57,029	63,146	77,820		
Indiana.....				
4,269	11,601	13,119	14,458	15,643
15,626	19,006	21,897		
Iowa.....				
4,239	7,925	8,733	11,043	14,227
16,063	16,591	21,241		
Kansas.....				
1,819	8,609	11,037	16,256	16,290
15,970	17,708	23,166		
Kentucky.....				
4,027	12,533	15,621	19,460	23,519
31,727	31,637	33,985		
Louisiana.....				
7,079	17,587	17,108	17,970	19,408
27,101	30,756	32,263		
Maine.....				
1,229	5,986	6,306	7,917	9,351
11,729	12,838	13,274		
Maryland.....				
8,177	32,384	33,791	38,281	39,805
43,013	43,254	48,042		
Massachusetts.....				

6,710	37,266	37,083	51,432	46,587
50,618	44,298	45,445		
Michigan.....				
24,614	55,775	65,825	71,196	82,380
86,420	94,058	103,693		
Minnesota.....				
9,273	22,656	27,480	33,242	38,947
42,877	44,399	51,081		
Mississippi.....				
1,574	4,590	6,230	10,883	19,551
22,943	21,717	24,272		
Missouri.....				
5,355	15,811	20,797	22,814	27,577
29,766	34,096	43,941		
Montana.....				
943	1,685	1,865	1,669	3,223
4,659	7,327	7,306		
Nebraska.....				
1,378	7,242	8,559	10,312	11,698
14,125	18,683	17,201		
Nevada.....				
1,891	4,285	5,537	5,912	7,654
9,247	10,493	15,759		
New Hampshire.....				
847	3,292	3,825	5,042	5,558
7,912	8,401	10,971		
New Jersey.....				
21,677	54,968	65,428	69,957	77,113
93,525	92,697	101,411		
New Mexico.....				
1,437	4,347	5,608	6,258	7,213
8,376	8,307	8,808		
New York.....				
61,665	136,254	126,133	119,132	146,468
153,007	151,589	172,888		
North Carolina.....				
5,721	18,234	25,951	32,113	37,868
44,495	52,514	61,668		
North Dakota.....				
702	2,071	2,256	2,541	2,879
3,432	3,971	4,619		

Ohio.....				
11,581	32,001	28,784	64,637	67,891
92,006	124,551	130,380		
Oklahoma.....				
2,771	7,384	8,651	11,450	14,073
16,532	17,284	16,682		
Oregon.....				
7,475	13,267	13,985	15,164	17,457
20,364	21,078	25,229		
Pennsylvania.....				
19,639	60,842	60,040	62,328	70,542
87,180	83,729	89,583		
Puerto Rico.....				
862	3,495	4,156	5,789	10,795
5,476	8,084	8,302		
Rhode Island.....				
1,079	3,570	4,052	4,413	7,945
7,507	10,750	6,124		
South Carolina.....				
1,777	11,150	12,522	15,379	20,127
19,539	19,148	20,437		
South Dakota.....				
1,060	2,118	2,358	2,588	2,785
2,963	3,292	3,700		
Tennessee.....				
3,046	12,507	12,389	16,482	16,709
18,050	21,904	21,430		
Texas.....				
11,733	23,522	29,733	45,563	68,709
77,055	99,077	134,053		
Utah.....				
3,094	10,379	10,453	11,307	12,317
15,689	17,072	19,626		
Vermont.....				
649	1,956	2,116	2,897	2,588
3,229	4,794	5,168		
Virgin Islands.....				
483	730	824	990	749
1,613	969	1,109		
Virginia.....				
4,787	24,399	31,738	31,573	47,061

41,482	49,972	49,212		
Washington.....				
10,733	28,293	35,926	47,853	56,189
65,314	81,400	89,812		
West Virginia.....				
1,676	4,870	6,740	6,201	7,869
9,238	11,952	17,677		
Wisconsin.....				
7,562	24,959	31,512	35,719	41,906
41,404	42,982	46,552		
Wyoming.....				
160	696	901	1,552	2,121
2,592	2,306	5,897		

-----

-----

Nationwide total.....

383,163	1,065,942	1,170,714	1,363,209	1,606,065
1,804,106	1,994,690	2,241,094		

-----

-----

-----

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement.

TABLE 11-23.--TOTAL CHILD SUPPORT COLLECTIONS PER DOLLAR  
OF TOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENDITURES, SELECTED  
FISCAL YEARS

1978-93

-----

-----

	State		1978	1985	1986	1987
1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	
U.S. ratio.....			3.35	3.31	3.45	3.68
3.94	3.85	3.75	3.82	3.99	3.98	

-----

-----

Alabama.....			.75	2.00	2.45	2.69
--------------	--	--	-----	------	------	------

-----

2.50	2.46	2.78	2.68	3.11	3.27	
Alaska.....			3.19	2.26	2.61	3.05
3.46	4.06	4.14	3.64	3.92	3.71	
Arizona.....			.88	2.15	1.46	2.21
2.11	1.84	1.49	1.54	1.57	1.79	
Arkansas.....			1.00	1.90	2.62	2.94
2.94	3.38	2.80	3.00	3.15	3.20	
California.....			2.15	2.32	2.37	2.52
2.75	2.66	2.59	2.63	2.59	2.54	
Colorado.....			1.78	2.08	1.89	1.90
1.99	2.21	2.82	3.22	2.70	2.47	
Connecticut.....			4.20	3.38	3.49	2.91
2.73	2.76	2.46	2.73	2.97	3.19	
Delaware.....			7.14	5.62	2.46	3.07
2.62	3.01	3.13	2.87	2.88	2.39	
District of Columbia..			.73	1.06	.92	.97
1.21	1.33	1.78	1.88	2.33	2.51	
Florida.....			1.20	2.10	2.12	1.98
2.28	2.58	2.66	2.86	3.03	3.78	
Georgia.....			2.22	2.23	2.59	3.16
2.88	3.06	3.06	3.61	4.26	4.47	
Guam.....			.....	1.46	1.39	1.53
1.62	1.28	1.24	1.98	1.87	1.89	
Hawaii.....			1.71	2.38	2.26	3.10
3.62	3.62	3.64	4.06	3.94	3.79	
Idaho.....			2.10	1.93	3.58	4.06
3.79	3.95	4.02	3.21	3.62	3.43	
Illinois.....			2.10	2.14	2.40	2.51
2.68	2.77	2.61	2.63	2.90	2.36	
Indiana.....			2.42	3.79	4.82	5.22
5.49	5.34	6.15	7.27	6.56	6.45	
Iowa.....			3.49	5.92	6.77	6.12
6.36	5.66	4.99	5.02	5.79	5.14	
Kansas.....			3.01	2.05	2.15	2.58
2.51	2.00	2.76	3.43	3.73	2.57	
Kentucky.....			1.14	2.68	2.52	2.59
2.44	2.63	2.55	2.33	2.97	3.05	
Louisiana.....			1.82	2.13	1.99	2.28
2.60	2.85	3.12	2.51	2.74	3.19	
Maine.....			3.40	3.98	3.74	3.75
4.01	4.14	3.82	3.06	2.84	3.39	

Maryland.....	2.14	3.86	3.77	3.02
3.31      3.36      3.80	3.80	4.49	4.56	
Massachusetts.....	5.12	3.57	3.50	3.46
4.09      3.24      3.80	3.41	4.18	4.30	
Michigan.....	9.50	7.62	8.33	9.52
8.80      8.58      7.83	8.07	8.20	8.43	
Minnesota.....	2.15	2.91	3.02	3.51
3.59      3.65      3.58	3.74	4.27	4.20	
Mississippi.....	.87	2.02	2.29	3.36
3.06      2.23      1.56	1.76	2.22	2.20	
Missouri.....	.89	3.24	3.89	4.55
4.22      4.45      4.71	4.75	4.88	4.30	
Montana.....	1.58	2.46	2.59	3.16
2.97      4.21      2.74	2.78	2.38	2.76	
Nebraska.....	2.10	6.32	5.44	5.20
5.02      4.69      4.48	3.83	3.54	4.17	
Nevada.....	1.83	2.04	2.10	2.30
1.95      2.22      2.12	2.52	3.06	2.39	
New Hampshire.....	4.05	4.96	4.39	5.33
4.93      3.18      3.71	2.86	3.26	2.87	
New Jersey.....	4.16	4.67	4.64	4.47
4.12      3.85      3.66	3.49	4.02	4.02	
New Mexico.....	1.17	1.90	2.27	1.99
1.76      1.96      2.00	2.00	2.30	3.08	
New York.....	1.75	1.96	1.83	1.98
2.36      2.74      2.55	2.81	3.22	3.10	
North Carolina.....	1.50	2.94	3.26	3.83
3.32      3.20      3.18	3.15	3.20	3.20	
North Dakota.....	1.83	2.29	2.46	2.65
3.14      3.31      3.62	3.59	3.93	4.05	
Ohio.....	2.50	3.38	4.41	5.65
10.83      6.07      7.21	6.01	5.35	5.48	
Oklahoma.....	.76	1.46	1.78	2.22
2.48      2.28      2.29	2.41	2.69	3.13	
Oregon.....	9.48	4.05	4.47	4.03
4.27      4.45      4.49	4.48	5.10	4.95	
Pennsylvania.....	9.14	6.68	7.78	7.56
8.52      8.97      8.71	8.03	9.27	9.09	
Puerto Rico.....	.92	11.95	14.02	18.93
17.60      13.61      7.84	15.68	10.43	11.73	
Rhode Island.....	3.51	3.52	3.90	3.31

3.65	3.67	2.52	2.22	2.31	4.35	
South Carolina.....			2.38	1.70	2.37	3.01
3.23	3.01	2.60	3.01	3.59	3.88	
South Dakota.....			.99	2.36	2.74	2.96
3.50	3.99	3.96	4.43	4.82	4.90	
Tennessee.....			2.49	2.88	3.31	3.07
4.09	3.57	4.28	4.27	3.87	5.42	
Texas.....			.74	2.17	2.01	2.60
2.81	2.41	1.93	2.50	2.53	2.31	
Utah.....			1.99	1.95	2.21	2.39
2.86	2.92	3.09	2.80	3.08	2.86	
Vermont.....			2.24	2.58	2.34	2.95
3.31	2.93	3.61	3.77	2.82	3.06	
Virgin Islands.....			.40	3.27	2.14	4.13
4.16	3.11	4.18	2.07	4.10	4.50	
Virginia.....			.72	1.85	1.57	2.41
2.39	3.03	2.35	3.13	2.91	3.09	
Washington.....			2.96	2.48	2.42	2.56
2.48	2.66	3.13	3.41	3.29	3.42	
West Virginia.....			.74	1.66	1.98	2.00
2.16	2.95	2.75	2.55	2.98	2.77	
Wisconsin.....			3.80	3.73	4.78	6.20
6.01	6.18	5.76	6.68	6.83	7.15	
Wyoming.....			3.18	1.64	3.27	4.64
4.91	3.50	3.37	3.50	4.87	2.34	

-----  
 -----  
 Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement.

TABLE 11-24.--AFDC CHILD SUPPORT COLLECTIONS PER DOLLAR OF  
 TOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENDITURES, FISCAL YEARS

1980-93

State						1980	1983
1985	1987	1989	1990	1991	1992	993	
Alabama.....					1.22	0.85	
1.16	1.01	0.81	0.82	.75	.73	.65	

Alaska.....						.26	.
44	.43	.75	1.21	1.26	1.18	1.23	1.11
Arizona.....						.27	.
25	.27	.53	.34	.33	.34	.43	.50
Arkansas.....						.75	1.01
1.20	1.59	1.73	1.27	1.26	1.18	1.06	
California.....						1.05	1.08
1.17	1.27	1.29	1.23	1.27	1.24	1.15	
Colorado.....						.68	1.17
1.06	.94	.98	1.19	1.32	1.08	.95	
Connecticut.....						2.05	1.73
1.66	1.34	1.24	1.01	1.26	1.33	1.41	
Delaware.....						1.68	.69
2.02	.92	.88	.90	.83	.81	.70	
District of Columbia.....						.48	.
49	.59	.50	.51	.54	.50	.58	.60
Florida.....						1.11	.66
1.21	.81	.76	.73	.76	.84	1.02	
Georgia.....						1.38	1.38
1.63	1.66	1.23	1.24	1.46	1.82	1.84	
Guam.....						.79	.
82	.95	.73	.55	.45	.92	1.01	.88
Hawaii.....						1.41	1.21
1.05	1.10	1.14	1.10	1.04	.93	.92	
Idaho.....						1.99	1.77
1.43	1.52	1.27	1.22	1.02	1.11	.93	
Illinois.....						1.07	1.16
1.09	1.08	.92	.85	.86	.93	.72	
Indiana.....						1.66	2.61
2.77	2.71	2.58	2.44	2.93	2.59	2.38	
Iowa.....						2.69	3.29
4.11	3.51	2.41	2.01	1.90	2.13	1.73	
Kansas.....						1.35	1.50
1.75	1.41	.79	.93	1.09	1.18	.97	
Kentucky.....						.82	.82
1.01	.93	.96	.95	.87	1.10	1.08	
Louisiana.....						.86	.
75	.81	.90	1.08	1.07	.85	.84	.83
Maine.....						2.78	2.86
2.97	2.60	2.63	2.26	1.74	1.53	1.93	
Maryland.....						1.27	1.70



1.30	.85	.88	1.06	.86	1.07	1.07	
Massachusetts.....					3.12	2.04	
1.68	1.45	1.35	1.57	1.32	1.62	1.70	
Michigan.....					2.91	2.36	
2.50	2.29	1.94	1.76	1.78	1.74	1.64	
Minnesota.....					1.36	1.48	
1.52	1.58	1.27	1.13	1.11	1.20	1.10	
Mississippi.....					1.14	1.55	
1.41	1.65	1.07	.74	.85	.99	.89	
Missouri.....					.78	1.27	
1.69	1.49	1.35	1.38	1.24	1.46	1.16	
Montana.....					.83	1.63	
2.01	2.00	2.35	1.36	1.13	.88	.88	
Nebraska.....					1.56	1.04	
1.24	.85	.65	.60	.53	.49	.57	
Nevada.....					.28	.	
53	.48	.62	.51	.43	.48	.65	.45
New Hampshire.....					2.09		
1.21	.98	.83	.60	.65	.55	.75	.
70							
New Jersey.....					1.24	1.14	
1.19	1.07	.88	.80	.77	.90	.83	
New Mexico.....					.76	.90	
1.13	.95	.82	.77	.77	.94	1.47	
New York.....					.75	.	
79	.78	.75	.99	.91	1.02	1.15	1.07
North Carolina.....					1.29	1.53	
1.54	1.82	1.29	1.22	1.23	1.22	1.14	
North Dakota.....					1.68	1.61	
1.67	1.70	1.65	1.77	1.63	1.51	1.32	
Ohio.....					1.65	1.68	
1.94	2.09	1.09	1.13	.92	.81	.81	
Oklahoma.....					.40	.60	
1.04	.97	.87	.84	.90	1.02	1.13	
Oregon.....					1.40	1.15	
1.44	1.11	1.11	1.08	1.08	1.22	1.12	
Pennsylvania.....					1.35	1.10	
1.13	1.28	1.49	1.37	1.30	1.48	1.39	
Puerto Rico.....					.62	.	
27	.34	.52	.28	.16	.30	.18	.16
Rhode Island.....					2.52	1.97	

2.09	1.70	1.72	1.28	1.08	1.25	2.44	
South Carolina.....						2.04	2.08
1.19	1.19	.93	.79	.91	1.10	1.20	
South Dakota.....						1.29	1.81
1.73	1.44	1.49	1.33	1.42	1.48	1.37	
Tennessee.....						.92	.
79	.72	.97	1.21	1.37	1.54	1.04	1.56
Texas.....						.49	.72
1.14	.84	.76	.58	.61	.60	.49	
Utah.....						1.45	1.71
1.33	1.13	1.24	1.22	1.04	1.11	.99	
Vermont.....						1.87	2.74
2.21	2.14	1.78	2.16	2.33	1.39	1.48	
Virgin Islands.....						.28	.
44	.29	.33	.23	.28	.14	.28	.31
Virginia.....						1.33	1.53
1.58	.64	.72	.59	.82	.77	.80	
Washington.....						1.51	1.56
1.40	1.36	1.11	1.16	1.19	1.12	1.12	
West Virginia.....						.96	1.30
1.61	1.16	.77	.52	74	.79	.95	
Wisconsin.....						2.34	1.92
2.21	2.30	1.68	1.42	1.48	1.48	1.41	
Wyoming.....						2.29	2.12
1.06	2.14	1.19	1.22	1.24	1.63	.74	

-----

Nationwide total..... 1.30 1.27

1.34 1.27 1.17 1.09 1.10 1.13 1.08

-----

-----

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement.

TABLE 11-25.--NON-AFDC CHILD SUPPORT COLLECTIONS PER  
DOLLAR OF TOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENDITURES, FISCAL  
YEARS

1980-93

-----

-----

	State					1980	1983
1985	1987	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	
-----							
-----							
Alabama.....					0.00	0.09	
0.83	1.68	1.65	1.96	1.93	2.38	2.62	
Alaska.....					1.82	1.97	
1.83	2.29	2.86	2.88	2.46	2.69	2.60	
Arizona.....					1.81	1.55	
1.87	1.68	1.50	1.16	1.19	1.14	1.29	
Arkansas.....					.68	.	
62	.70	1.35	1.65	1.53	1.74	1.97	2.15
California.....					1.10	.92	
1.15	1.26	1.38	1.36	1.36	1.34	1.38	
Colorado.....					.40	.98	
1.01	.95	1.23	1.63	1.90	1.62	1.51	
Connecticut.....					1.99	1.56	
1.73	1.56	1.52	1.45	1.47	1.64	1.78	
Delaware.....					4.71	1.76	
3.60	2.15	2.12	2.22	2.04	2.07	1.69	
District of Columbia.....					.14	.	
22	.47	.47	.82	1.24	1.38	1.75	1.91
Florida.....					.16	.	
55	.90	1.17	1.82	1.93	2.10	2.20	2.76
Georgia.....					.18	.	
25	.59	1.50	1.83	1.82	2.15	2.44	2.63
Guam.....					.01	.	
42	.51	.80	.74	.79	1.06	.87	1.00
Hawaii.....					2.02	1.51	
1.32	1.99	2.48	2.54	3.02	3.00	2.87	
Idaho.....					.52	.	
41	.49	2.55	2.68	2.80	2.18	2.51	2.50
Illinois.....					.11	.80	
1.04	1.42	1.85	1.76	1.77	1.97	1.65	
Indiana.....					.26	.46	
1.02	2.51	2.77	3.71	4.34	3.97	4.07	
Iowa.....					.69	1.64	
1.81	2.61	3.25	2.98	3.12	3.66	3.41	
Kansas.....					.31	.	
41	.30	1.17	1.21	1.83	2.34	2.55	1.61
Kentucky.....					2.26	1.74	

1.67	1.66	1.67	1.60	1.46	1.87	1.97	
Louisiana.....					1.07	1.25	
1.32	1.38	1.76	2.04	1.66	1.90	2.36	
Maine.....					.38	.62	
1.01	1.15	1.51	1.57	1.32	1.31	1.45	
Maryland.....					1.28	3.02	
2.56	2.18	2.48	2.74	2.94	3.41	3.49	
Massachusetts.....					1.16	1.61	
1.89	2.01	1.89	2.32	2.09	2.56	2.60	
Michigan.....					7.96	4.26	
5.12	7.24	6.64	6.06	6.29	6.45	6.80	
Minnesota.....					.72	1.11	
1.39	1.93	2.38	2.45	2.63	3.07	3.10	
Mississippi.....					.10	.	
12	.61	1.71	1.16	.82	.91	1.23	1.31
Missouri.....					.74	.73	
1.55	3.06	3.11	3.33	3.51	3.42	3.14	
Montana.....					.69	.	
52	.45	1.17	1.86	1.37	1.66	1.50	1.87
Nebraska.....					.30	4.62	
5.08	4.35	4.04	3.88	3.30	3.05	3.60	
Nevada.....					.98	1.09	
1.55	1.67	1.71	1.69	2.04	2.41	1.94	
New Hampshire.....					.08	4.08	
3.98	4.50	2.58	3.06	2.31	2.50	2.17	
New Jersey.....					2.90	2.83	
3.47	3.40	2.97	2.86	2.73	3.12	3.19	
New Mexico.....					.34	.	
54	.77	1.05	1.14	1.23	1.24	1.35	1.61
New York.....					1.47	1.22	
1.18	1.23	1.75	1.64	1.79	2.07	2.03	
North Carolina.....					.28	.98	
1.40	2.00	1.91	1.96	1.92	1.98	2.06	
North Dakota.....					.43	.	
57	.62	.95	1.66	1.84	1.95	2.41	2.73
Ohio.....					.06	.07	
1.43	3.56	4.98	6.08	5.09	4.54	4.67	
Oklahoma.....					.19	.	
26	.42	1.25	1.41	1.44	1.51	1.67	2.00
Oregon.....					8.15	2.30	
2.61	2.92	3.34	3.41	3.40	3.88	3.83	

Pennsylvania.....	6.70	5.56
5.55      6.28      7.48      7.34      6.72      7.79      7.70		
Puerto Rico.....	1.56	9.21
11.61      18.42      13.32      6.75      15.38      10.25      11.57		
Rhode Island.....	.10	1.39
1.43      1.61      1.95      1.24      1.14      1.06      1.91		
South Carolina.....	.39	.
50      .51      1.83      2.08      1.81      2.10      2.49      2.68		
South Dakota.....	.38	.
56      .64      1.52      2.50      2.62      3.01      3.34      3.53		
Tennessee.....	1.55	1.92
2.16      2.10      2.36      2.91      2.72      2.83      3.86		
Texas.....	.19	.47
1.03      1.76      1.65      1.35      1.89      1.94      1.81		
Utah.....	.31	.
29      .62      1.26      1.68      1.87      1.76      1.97      1.87		
Vermont.....	.35	.
21      .37      .82      1.15      1.46      1.44      1.43      1.59		
Virgin Islands.....	.46	1.70
2.97      3.80      2.88      3.90      1.92      3.81      4.19		
Virginia.....	.08	.
24      .27      1.78      2.31      1.76      2.31      2.14      2.28		
Washington.....	.85	.89
1.08      1.20      1.55      1.97      2.22      2.17      2.30		
West Virginia.....	.07	.
05      .05      .84      2.18      2.23      1.80      2.18      1.82		
Wisconsin.....	.65	.80
1.52      3.90      4.50      4.34      5.21      5.34      5.74		
Wyoming.....	.96	.
61      .58      2.50      2.31      2.16      2.26      3.24      1.61		

---



---

Nationwide total.....	1.88	1.66
1.97      2.41      2.68      2.65      2.72      2.86      2.90		

---



---

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement.

TABLE 11-26.--TOTAL NUMBER OF PATERNITIES

ESTABLISHED, SELECTED FISCAL YEARS 1979-93

-----					
-----					
	State			1979	1983
1987	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993
-----					
Total.....				137,645	208,270
269,161	339,243	393,304	472,105	515,857	553,135

-----					
Alabama.....				6,161	4,833
6,998	7,839	6,517	6,612	7,942	10,779
Alaska.....				3	105
364	797	767	673	906	1,070
Arizona.....				154	595
1,009	1,327	1,237	2,674	3,056	5,007
Arkansas.....				2,586	1,489
5,326	4,453	3,191	4,703	5,175	6,580
California.....				19,364	21,714
28,570	35,193	41,065	56,912	65,062	77,324
Colorado.....				1,046	1,033
1,291	1,939	1,864	2,887	4,135	5,258
Connecticut.....				3,029	4,563
3,908	3,888	4,499	5,309	6,196	5,368
Delaware.....				205	1,346
1,867	1,641	801	728	1,573	1,395
District of Columbia.....				386	811
1,021	2,079	2,791	3,895	2,792	2,884
Florida.....				7,078	10,679
12,136	13,399	19,534	17,907	16,119	10,879
Georgia.....				3,642	6,102
14,112	18,198	24,615	28,015	30,181	29,329
Guam.....				NA	173
122	109	563	884	642	440
Hawaii.....				854	1,181
1,061	1,295	1,843	1,672	1,419	1,746
Idaho.....				287	84
384	1,100	1,310	1,551	1,722	1,509
Illinois.....				3,025	7,339

20,848	29,926	25,496	21,157	18,900	19,017
Indiana.....				1,644	3,036
3,570	4,943	5,309	6,291	5,631	4,950
Iowa.....				575	922
1,664	1,980	3,045	1,904	4,416	4,952
Kansas.....				696	682
1,119	2,101	3,644	3,125	3,198	4,445
Kentucky.....				784	2,986
3,881	4,498	6,092	6,816	7,951	7,979
Louisiana.....				1,304	3,195
2,926	4,451	5,525	11,098	11,764	13,272
Maine.....				382	604
951	1,609	1,381	1,376	3,189	1,370
Maryland.....				13,307	8,211
6,671	9,995	7,538	12,081	11,259	9,993
Massachusetts.....				2,096	3,766
7,025	6,194	6,339	5,742	8,195	6,234
Michigan.....				7,529	17,374
18,274	23,142	25,574	27,955	29,087	28,076
Minnesota.....				1,786	2,994
3,856	6,098	5,661	7,695	5,348	3,749
Mississippi.....				932	1,797
1,824	7,929	10,740	11,950	8,978	8,588
Missouri.....				NA	17,522
14,308	11,146	16,242	21,976	23,982	24,292
Montana.....				92	37
179	388	429	677	1,155	413
Nebraska.....				NA	410
710	759	885	1,280	1,628	2,019
Nevada.....				233	409
531	664	1,033	1,655	1,702	1,602
New Hampshire.....				35	30
195	518	614	645	580	604
New Jersey.....				8,242	10,616
13,938	13,182	12,243	10,595	10,314	7,453
New Mexico.....				322	1,141
412	1,571	1,992	1,601	1,591	2,491
New York.....				17,503	15,884
18,239	18,056	20,492	30,197	34,434	42,748
North Carolina.....				6,592	7,368
9,916	11,663	14,504	18,186	19,308	21,371

North Dakota.....				293	440
1,134	820	784	935	1,446	1,386
Ohio.....				4,808	7,767
9,133	11,637	15,823	20,857	23,672	28,151
Oklahoma.....				43	1,811
512	1,361	2,710	4,939	2,721	2,764
Oregon.....				1,521	2,173
1,902	3,131	4,081	3,836	4,942	5,830
Pennsylvania.....				4,450	11,906
15,277	18,921	20,231	23,063	24,239	23,246
Puerto Rico.....				22	19
6	144	216	264	198	206
Rhode Island.....				347	451
601	673	868	764	1,425	2,001
South Carolina.....				1,378	2,552
3,994	5,243	5,273	6,066	6,996	8,331
South Dakota.....				60	172
552	504	509	687	916	1,333
Tennessee.....				5,003	6,592
7,666	9,647	8,976	10,309	10,902	11,463
Texas.....				202	1,085
684	6,465	12,623	19,627	24,890	30,002
Utah.....				487	1,546
1,292	1,801	2,087	2,484	2,957	3,496
Vermont.....				44	349
1,091	468	533	438	800	1,065
Virgin Islands.....				4	104
235	270	160	215	344	492
Virginia.....				1,452	2,351
2,667	8,471	13,647	15,971	18,038	21,506
Washington.....				656	1,700
4,066	5,762	6,985	8,601	10,540	12,539
West Virginia.....				156	467
288	820	997	1,324	2,373	2,790
Wisconsin.....				4,803	5,688
8,750	8,695	10,808	12,931	15,435	17,678
Wyoming.....				44	66
105	340	618	370	3,493	3,670

-----  
 -----  
 NA=Not available.



Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement.

TABLE 11-27.--OUT-  
OF-WEDLOCK BIRTHS AND IV-D PATERNITIES: 1987-91

					Paternities/ births (percent)
State					
1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1987
1988	1989	1990	1991		
Alabama.....					
15,955	16,934	18,640	19,131	20,000	43.9
44.5	42.1	34.1	33.05		
Alaska.....					
2,564	2,627	2,869	3,113	3,148	14.2
22.9	27.8	24.6	21.38		
Arizona.....					
17,227	18,815	20,708	22,532	23,899	5.9
3.8	6.4	5.5	11.19		
Arkansas.....					
8,498	9,273	9,944	10,713	10,601	62.7
63.7	44.8	29.8	44.36		
California.....					
136,785	152,607	171,189	193,559	204,229	20.9
23.6	20.6	21.2	27.87		
Colorado.....					
10,171	10,431	10,787	11,374	12,684	12.7
14.8	18.0	16.4	22.76		
Connecticut.....					
11,045	11,460	13,005	13,330	13,581	35.4

30.4	29.9	33.8	39.09			
Delaware.....						
2,742	2,819	3,125	3,222	3,559	68.1	
56.2	52.5	24.9	20.46			
District of Columbia.....						
6,094	6,507	7,580	7,692	7,806	16.8	
16.2	27.4	36.3	49.90			
Florida.....						
48,200	52,867	58,305	63,169	64,101	25.2	
28.1	23.0	30.9	27.94			
Georgia.....						
28,647	31,348	34,926	36,979	38,116	49.3	
68.0	52.1	66.6	73.50			
Hawaii.....						
3,968	4,222	4,609	5,088	5,195	26.7	
34.2	28.1	36.2	32.18			
Idaho.....						
2,073	2,216	2,561	2,738	2,924	18.5	
26.6	43.0	47.8	53.04			
Illinois.....						
50,677	54,436	58,867	62,148	63,225	41.1	
49.3	50.8	41.0	33.46			
Indiana.....						
17,260	18,543	19,898	22,562	24,294	20.7	
27.7	24.8	23.5	25.90			
Iowa.....						
6,147	6,736	7,575	8,282	8,657	27.1	
28.1	26.1	36.8	21.99			
Kansas.....						
6,633	7,025	7,577	8,397	8,746	16.9	
21.4	27.7	43.4	35.73			
Kentucky.....						
10,658	11,206	12,048	12,829	13,796	36.4	
38.4	37.3	47.5	49.41			
Louisiana.....						
23,594	24,752	25,692	26,601	27,694	12.4	
14.0	17.3	20.8	40.07			
Maine.....						
3,338	3,489	3,806	3,931	4,180	28.5	
50.9	42.3	35.1	32.92			
Maryland.....						

22,866	24,716	22,607	23,789	24,292	29.2
37.4	44.2	31.7	49.73		
Massachusetts.....					
17,616	19,559	21,798	22,886	22,873	39.9
41.4	28.4	27.7	25.10		
Michigan.....					
28,724	30,195	36,441	40,289	40,941	63.6
66.9	63.5	63.5	68.28		
Minnesota.....					
11,114	12,235	13,142	14,192	14,984	34.7
35.0	46.4	39.9	51.35		
Mississippi.....					
14,499	15,824	16,958	17,627	18,317	12.6
18.5	46.8	60.9	65.24		
Missouri.....					
17,823	19,124	21,123	22,643	23,736	80.3
40.9	52.8	71.7	92.59		
Montana.....					
2,379	2,430	2,539	2,757	2,898	7.5
13.0	15.3	15.6	23.36		
Nebraska.....					
4,006	4,333	4,662	5,056	5,181	17.7
17.7	16.3	17.5	24.71		
Nevada.....					
2,740	3,432	4,607	5,480	7,016	19.4
18.4	14.4	18.9	23.59		
New Hampshire.....					
2,511	2,503	2,797	2,967	2,996	7.8
13.8	18.5	20.7	21.53		
New Jersey.....					
26,647	28,580	29,364	29,756	31,972	52.3
45.6	44.9	41.1	33.14		
New Mexico.....					
8,067	8,711	9,447	9,704	10,445	5.1
11.2	16.6	20.5	15.33		
New York.....					
80,939	84,381	92,996	98,110	99,738	22.5
20.3	19.4	20.9	30.28		
North Carolina.....					
23,262	25,622	28,315	30,718	32,340	42.6
43.8	41.2	47.2	56.23		

North Dakota.....						
1,429	1,578	1,615	1,699	1,952	79.4	
64.8	50.8	46.1	47.90			
Ohio.....						
39,237	42,448	45,921	48,289	50,826	23.3	
19.7	25.3	32.8	41.04			
Oklahoma.....						
9,892	10,600	11,258	11,998	12,973	5.2	
9.9	12.1	22.6	38.07			
Oregon.....						
8,672	9,435	10,436	11,041	11,324	21.9	
18.9	30.0	37.0	33.87			
Pennsylvania.....						
41,143	43,919	47,093	49,258	51,360	37.1	
36.7	40.2	41.1	44.90			
Rhode Island.....						
3,064	3,262	3,684	3,997	4,073	19.6	
24.6	18.3	21.7	18.76			
South Carolina.....						
15,333	16,722	18,116	19,148	20,000	26.1	
34.0	28.9	27.5	30.33			
South Dakota.....						
2,225	2,334	2,415	2,515	2,720	24.8	
24.6	20.9	20.2	25.26			
Tennessee.....						
17,897	19,511	21,281	22,662	24,026	42.8	
43.1	45.3	39.6	42.91			
Texas.....						
57,464	59,820	60,303	55,435	56,528	1.2	
1.7	10.7	22.8	34.72			
Utah.....						
3,929	4,221	4,504	4,910	5,196	32.9	
35.0	40.0	42.5	47.81			
Vermont.....						
1,459	1,510	1,685	1,666	1,811	74.8	
115.0	27.8	32.0	24.19			
Virginia.....						
20,562	22,126	24,410	25,874	27,125	1.3	
26.0	34.7	52.7	58.88			
Washington.....						
14,629	16,150	17,638	18,746	19,861	27.8	

28.8	32.7	37.3	43.31			
West Virginia.....						
4,722	4,948	5,212	5,743	6,040	6.1	
16.0	15.7	17.4	21.92			
Wisconsin.....						
14,698	15,528	16,815	17,656	18,235	59.5	
55.8	51.7	61.2	70.91			
Wyoming.....						
1,189	1,229	1,276	1,383	1,546	8.8	
6.4	26.7	44.7	23.93			
-----						
-----						
U.S. total.....						
933,013	1,005,299	1,094,169	1,165,384	1,213,769	28.8	
30.5	31.0	33.7	38.78			
-----						
-----						

Sources: National Center for Health Statistics. Monthly Vital Statistics Report, vol. 41, no. 9, Supplement, Feb. 25, 1993, page 36, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Child Support Enforcement.

TABLE 11-28.--STATE SHARE OF SAVINGS FOR FIVE CONSECUTIVE FISCAL YEARS

[In thousands of dollars]

	State				
1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	
-----					
-----					
Alabama.....					
380	-518	-1,982	-3,053	-2,529	
Alaska.....					
2,264	2,469	2,982	3,431	3,797	
Arizona.....					

-1,219	-2,899	-3,125	-3,320	-4,242
Arkansas.....				
1,574	1,013	1,830	1,009	530
California.....				
79,779	76,552	88,584	98,465	101,406
Colorado.....				
4,552	4,991	5,954	5,661	6,064
Connecticut.....				
11,330	7,310	10,332	11,711	13,396
Delaware.....				
797	812	923	902	455
District of Columbia.....				
-3,145	-89	-574	144	757
Florida.....				
5,601	2,932	7,179	11,482	14,368
Georgia.....				
2,861	1,299	3,930	7,937	12,856
Guam.....				
-87	-227	-293	-450	-305
Hawaii.....				
1,648	1,622	1,502	1,655	1,873
Idaho.....				
1,029	895	751	955	922
Illinois.....				
10,935	5,159	5,785	9,767	3,716
Indiana.....				
14,027	11,731	16,134	20,359	20,257
Iowa.....				
11,767	11,631	10,840	11,765	11,000
Kansas.....				
1,170	2,229	3,694	4,041	3,711
Kentucky.....				
207	207	-475	1,958	3,467
Louisiana.....				
696	150	-1,049	-1,845	-1,241
Maine.....				
5,236	4,229	3,852	3,890	5,877
Maryland.....				
6,860	8,631	6,120	10,366	12,037
Massachusetts.....				
23,373	23,391	21,789	25,917	29,957

Michigan.....				
57,413	54,088	58,032	53,107	52,078
Minnesota.....				
13,969	12,083	11,468	12,377	12,274
Mississippi.....				
-232	-2,987	-2,549	-1,243	-1,065
Missouri.....				
8,046	9,002	7,846	11,772	10,303
Montana.....				
1,093	769	454	532	618
Nebraska.....				
-252	-572	-582	-2,093	-1,054
Nevada.....				
-32	-417	-334	608	-172
New Hampshire.....				
362	185	271	826	443
New Jersey.....				
15,081	6,836	9,100	13,551	11,876
New Mexico.....				
305	-148	-361	-224	1,278
New York.....				
24,201	22,865	30,313	41,091	41,790
North Carolina.....				
5,857	3,598	4,257	6,343	6,962
North Dakota.....				
955	1,074	1,231	973	989
Ohio.....				
21,558	12,040	6,054	445	3,453
Oklahoma.....				
705	69	380	1,110	2,457
Oregon.....				
3,703	2,658	3,358	4,863	5,935
Pennsylvania.....				
22,018	19,846	21,226	27,102	29,234
Puerto Rico.....				
-1,075	-3,121	-2,165	-2,008	-2,171
Rhode Island.....				
2,999	3,439	3,940	4,375	5,427
South Carolina.....				
490	-1,639	91	437	1,309
South Dakota.....				

969	1,254	820	672	1,048
Tennessee.....				
1,278	3,432	5,989	1,578	5,915
Texas.....				
2,163	-4,832	-4,774	-6,111	13,969
Utah.....				
1,362	1,111	892	980	343
Vermont.....				
1,440	1,957	1,918	1,621	2,066
Virgin Islands.....				
-223	-184	-459	-227	-256
Virginia.....				
2,567	-1,113	4,292	4,324	6,347
Washington.....				
15,386	14,053	22,038	19,695	24,875
West Virginia.....				
-59	-1,214	-722	-1,047	16
Wisconsin.....				
21,306	18,451	16,740	15,553	15,386
Wyoming.....				
574	363	340	589	226

---

Nationwide total.....				
403,400	338,469	384,691	433,317	462,092

---

Note.--Numbers may not sum to total due to rounding.

Source: Office of Child Support Enforcement.

## LEGISLATIVE CHANGES IN THE 103D CONGRESS

### 1. State Paternity Establishment Programs

Public Law 103-66, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, increases the percentage of children for whom the State must establish paternity and requires States to adopt laws requiring civil procedures to voluntarily acknowledge



paternity  
(including hospital-based programs).

## 2. Enforcement of Health Insurance Support

Public Law 103-66, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, requires States to adopt laws to ensure the compliance of health insurers and employers in carrying out court or administrative orders for medical child support and includes a provision that forbids health insurers to deny coverage to children who are not living with the covered individual or who were born outside of marriage.

TABLE 11-29.--CBO FEDERAL BUDGET COST ESTIMATES FOR  
CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT AMENDMENTS IN THE OMNIBUS  
BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF  
1993 (PUBLIC LAW 103-66)

[In millions of

dollars]

-----  
-----

Fiscal years

----- Total

1994      1995      1996      1997      1998

-----  
-----

Paternity establishment programs.....

0          0          -30        -70        -110       -210

Medical child support.....

0          -15        -20        -20        -25        -80

-----  
Total.....

0          -15        -50        -90        -135       -290

-----  
-----  
Source: Congressional Budget Office.

## LEGISLATIVE CHANGES IN THE 102D CONGRESS

### 1. Criminal Penalties for Willful Failure to Pay Child Support in Interstate Cases

Public Law 102-521, the Child Support Recovery Act of 1992, imposes a Federal criminal penalty for the willful failure to pay a past-due child support obligation with respect to a child who resides in another State that has remained unpaid for longer than a year or is greater than \$5,000. For the first conviction the penalty would be a fine of up to \$5,000 and/or imprisonment for not more than 6 months; for a second conviction, a fine of not more than \$250,000 and/or imprisonment for up to 2 years.

### 2. Inclusion of Child Support Debt Information By Consumer Credit Reporting Agencies

Public Law 102-537, the Ted Weiss Child Support Enforcement Act of 1992, amends the Fair Credit Reporting Act to require consumer credit reporting agencies to include in any consumer report information on child support delinquencies provided by or verified by State or local CSE agencies, which antedates the report by 7 years.

## LEGISLATIVE CHANGES IN THE 101ST CONGRESS

### 1. Extension of IRS Intercept for non-AFDC Families

The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-508) permanently extends the Federal provision that allows States to ask the IRS to collect child support arrearages of at least \$500 out of income tax refunds otherwise due to noncustodial parents. The minor child restriction is to be eliminated for adults with a current support order who are disabled, as defined under OASDI or SSI. In addition, the offset can be used for spousal support when spousal and child support are included in the same support order.

### 2. Extension of Interstate Child Support Commission

The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-508) extends the life of the Interstate Child Support Commission from July 1, 1991, to July 1, 1992, and requires it to submit its report no later than May 1, 1992. Also, the provision authorizes the Commission to hire its own staff.

### 3. Medicaid Transition in Child Support Cases

The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989 (P.L. 101-239) made permanent the requirement that Medicaid benefits continue for 4 months after a family loses AFDC eligibility as a result of collection of child support payments.

## LEGISLATIVE CHANGES IN THE 100TH CONGRESS

During the second session of the 100th Congress, The Family Support Act of 1988 (P.L. 100-485) was enacted. It emphasized

the duties of parents to work and support their children. The Act emphasized child support enforcement as the first line of defense against welfare dependence. It contained these provisions:

#### 1. Guidelines for Child Support Award Amounts

Judges and other officials are required to use State guidelines for child support unless they are rebutted by a written finding that applying the guidelines would be unjust or inappropriate in a particular case. States must review guidelines for awards every 4 years. Beginning 5 years after enactment, States generally must review and adjust individual case awards every 3 years for AFDC cases. The same applies to other IV-D cases, except review and adjustment must be at the request of a parent.

#### 2. Establishment of Paternity

States are required to meet Federal standards for the establishment of paternity. The standard relates to the percentage obtained by dividing the number of children in the State who are born out of wedlock, are receiving cash benefits or IV-D child support services, and for whom paternity has been established by the number of children who are born out of wedlock and are receiving cash benefits or IV-D child support services. To meet Federal requirements, this percentage in a State must: (1) be at least 50 percent; (2) be at least equal

to the average for all States; or (3) have increased by 3 percentage points from fiscal years 1988 to 1991 and by 3 percentage points each year thereafter.

States are mandated to require all parties in a contested paternity case to take a genetic test upon request of any party.

The Federal matching rate for laboratory testing to establish paternity is set at 90 percent.

### 3. Disregard of Child Support

The child support enforcement disregard authorized under the Deficit Reduction Act of 1984 is clarified so that it applies to a payment made by the noncustodial parent in the month it was due even though it was received in a subsequent month.

### 4. Requirement for Prompt State Response

The Secretary of Health and Human Services is required to set time limits within which States must accept and respond to requests for assistance in establishing and enforcing support orders as well as time limits within which child support payments collected by the State IV-D agency must be distributed to the families to whom they are owed.

### 5. Requirement for Automated Tracking and Monitoring System

Every State that does not have a Statewide automated tracking and monitoring system in effect must submit an advance planning document that meets Federal requirements by October 1, 1991. The Secretary must approve each document within 9

months  
after submission. By October 1, 1995, every State must have  
an  
approved system in effect. Federal matching rates of 90  
percent  
for this activity will expire after September 30, 1995.

## 6. Interstate Enforcement

A Commission on Interstate Child Support is established  
to  
hold one or more national conferences on interstate child  
support enforcement reform, and to report to Congress no  
later  
than October 1, 1990 on recommendations for improvements in  
the  
system and revisions in the Uniform Reciprocal Enforcement  
of  
Support Act.

## 7. Exclude Interstate Demonstration Grants in Computing Incentive Payments

Amounts spent by States for interstate demonstration  
projects are excluded from calculating the amount of the  
States' incentive payments.

## 8. Use of INTERNET System

The Secretaries of Labor and HHS are required to enter  
into  
an agreement to give the Federal Parent Locator Service  
prompt  
access to wage and unemployment compensation claims  
information  
useful in locating absent parents.

## 9. Wage Withholding

With respect to IV-D cases, each State must provide for

immediate wage withholding in the case of orders that are issued or modified on or after the first day of the 25th month

beginning after the date of enactment unless: (1) one of the

parties demonstrates, and the court finds, that there is good

cause not to require such withholding; or (2) there is a written agreement between both parties providing for an alternative arrangement. Present law requirements for mandatory

wage withholding in cases where payments are in arrears apply

to orders that are not subject to immediate wage withholding.

States are required to provide for immediate wage withholding for all support orders initially issued on or after

January 1, 1994, regardless of whether a parent has applied for

IV-D services.

#### 10. Work and Training Demonstration Programs for Noncustodial Parents

The Secretary of HHS is required to grant waivers to up to

5 States to allow them to provide services to noncustodial parents under the JOBS program. No new power is granted to the

States to require participation by noncustodial parents.

#### 11. Data Collection and Reporting

The Secretary of HHS is required to collect and maintain

State-by-State statistics on paternity determination, location

of absent parent for the purpose of establishing a support obligation, enforcement of a child support obligation, and location of absent parent for the purpose of enforcing or

modifying an established obligation.

## 12. Use of Social Security Number

Each State must, in the administration of any law involving the issuance of a birth certificate, require each parent to furnish his or her social security number (SSN), unless the State finds good cause for not requiring the parent to furnish it. The SSN shall not appear on the birth certificate, and the use of the SSN obtained through the birth record is restricted to child support enforcement purposes except under certain circumstances.

## 13. Notification of Support Collected

Each State is required to inform families receiving AFDC of the amount of support collected on their behalf on a monthly basis, rather than annually as provided under present law. States may provide quarterly notification if the Secretary of HHS determines that monthly reporting imposes an unreasonable administrative burden. This provision is effective 4 years after the date of enactment.

TABLE 11-30.--CBO FEDERAL BUDGET COST ESTIMATES FOR CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT AMENDMENTS IN THE FAMILY SUPPORT ACT OF 1988 (PUBLIC LAW 100-

485)

[In millions of dollars]

-----  
-----

Fiscal years--



		1990	1991	1992
1993	Total			
-----				
-----				
Mandate income withholding.	.....		-25	-55
-90	-170			
Mandate child support				
guidelines.....	-25	-70	-115	
-160	-370			
Mandate increases in				
paternity establishment...	.....	40	25	
15	80			
Mandate ADP for most States	2	7	7	
7	23			
Other.....	10	9	6	
8	33			
-----				
	Total.....	-13	-39	-132
-220	-404			
-----				

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987 (P.L. 100-203) required States to provide child support enforcement services to all families with an absent parent who receives Medicaid and have assigned their support rights to the State, regardless of whether they are receiving AFDC.

#### LEGISLATIVE CHANGES IN THE 99TH CONGRESS

During the second session of the 99th Congress, Public Law 99-509 was enacted. Titled the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986, the new law included one child support enforcement

amendment prohibiting the retroactive modification of child support awards. Under this new requirement, State laws must provide for either parent to apply for modification of an existing order with notice provided to the other parent. No modification is permitted before the date of this notification.

#### LEGISLATIVE CHANGES IN THE 98TH CONGRESS

In November 1983, the House of Representatives adopted H.R.

4325, the Child Support Enforcement Amendments, which had been developed by the Subcommittee on Public Assistance and Unemployment Compensation and approved by the Committee on Ways and Means. In August 1984, the amendments were signed into law.

The new law strengthens the child support enforcement and paternity establishment program. It requires States to implement effective enforcement tools and provides incentives to the States to make available services to both AFDC and non-AFDC families. The main provisions of the Child Support Enforcement Amendments of 1984 (P.L. 98-378) are summarized below:

1. Improved child support enforcement through requiring State laws and procedures.--States are required to enact laws establishing the following procedures with respect to their IV-D cases:

- A. Mandatory wage withholding for all families (AFDC and non-AFDC) if support payments are delinquent in an amount equal to 1 month's support. States must also allow absent parents to request withholding at an earlier date.

- B. Imposing liens against real and personal property

for  
amounts of overdue support.

C. Withholding of State tax refunds payable to a parent of a child receiving IV-D services, if the parent is delinquent in support payments.

D. Making available information regarding the amount of overdue support owed by an absent parent, to any consumer credit bureau, upon request of such organization.

E. Requiring individuals who have demonstrated a pattern of delinquent payments to post a bond, or give some other guarantee to secure payment of overdue support.

F. Establishing expedited processes within the State judicial system or under administrative procedures for obtaining and enforcing child support orders and, at the option of the State, for determining paternity.

G. Notifying each AFDC recipient at least once each year of the amount of child support collected on behalf of that recipient.

H. Permitting the establishment of paternity until a child's 18th birthday.

I. At the option of the State, providing that child support payments must be made through the agency that administers the State's income withholding system if either the custodial or noncustodial parent requests that they be made in this manner.

2. Federal matching of administrative costs.--The Federal matching share is gradually reduced from 70 percent as follows:

68 percent in fiscal years 1988 and 1989, and 66 percent in fiscal year 1990 and each year thereafter.

3. Federal incentive payments.--The prior incentive formula

which gave States 12 percent of their AFDC collections (paid for out of the Federal share of the collections) is replaced with a new formula that is designed to encourage States to develop programs that emphasize collections on behalf of both AFDC and non-AFDC families, and to improve program cost effectiveness. The basic incentive payment will be equal to 6 percent of the State's AFDC collections, and 6 percent of its non-AFDC collections. States may qualify for higher incentive payments, up to a maximum of 10 percent of collections, if their AFDC or non-AFDC collections exceed combined administrative costs for both AFDC and non-AFDC components of the program.

The total dollar amount of incentives paid for non-AFDC families may not exceed the amount of the State's incentive payment for AFDC collections for fiscal years 1986 and 1987.

However, thereafter the incentive paid for non-AFDC collections will be capped at an amount equal to 105 percent of the incentive for AFDC collections in fiscal year 1988, 110 percent in fiscal year 1989, and 115 percent in fiscal year 1990 and any fiscal year thereafter.

4. Matching for automated management systems used in income withholding and other procedures.--The Act specifies that the 90 percent Federal matching rate that is currently available to States that elect to establish an automatic data processing and information retrieval system may be used, at the option of the

State, for the development and improvement of the income withholding and other procedures required in the new law through the monitoring of child support payments, the maintenance of accurate records regarding the payment of child support, and the provision of prompt notice to appropriate officials with respect to any arrearages that occur. Also, the Act specifies that the 90 percent matching is available to pay for the acquisition of computer hardware.

5. Fees for services to non-AFDC families.--States will be required to charge an application fee for non-AFDC cases not to exceed \$25. The amount of the maximum allowable fee may be adjusted periodically by the Secretary to reflect changes in administrative costs. The State may charge the fee against the custodial parent, pay the fee out of State funds, or recover the fee from the noncustodial parent.

In addition, at the option of the State, a late payment fee equal to between 3 and 6 percent of the amount of overdue support may be charged to the noncustodial parents of AFDC and non-AFDC families. The State may not take any action which would have the effect of reducing the amount of support paid to the child and will collect the fee only after the full amount of the support has been paid to the child. The late payment fee provision is effective upon enactment.

6. Continuation of support enforcement for AFDC recipients whose benefits are being terminated.--States must provide that families whose eligibility for AFDC is terminated due to

the receipt of (or an increase in) child support payments will be automatically transferred from AFDC to non-AFDC status under the IV-D program, without requiring application for IV-D services or payment of a fee.

7. Special project grants to promote improvement in interstate enforcement.--The Secretary is authorized to make demonstration grants to States which propose to undertake new or innovative methods of support collection in interstate cases. The authorization is \$7 million in FY 1985, \$12 million in FY 1986, and \$15 million in FY 1987 and years thereafter.

8. Periodic review of State programs; modification of penalty.--The Director of the Federal Office of Child Support Enforcement is required to conduct audits at least every 3 years to determine whether the standards and requirements prescribed by law and regulations have been met. Under the penalty provision, a State's AFDC matching funds must be reduced by an amount equal to at least 1 but no more than 2 percent for the first failure to comply substantially with the standards and requirements, at least 2 but no more than 3 percent for the second failure, and at least 3 but no more than 5 percent for the third and any subsequent consecutive failures.

9. Extension of sec. 1115 demonstration authority to the child support program.--The sec. 1115 demonstration authority is expanded to include the child support enforcement program under specified conditions.

10. Child support enforcement for certain children in foster care.--State child support agencies are required to

undertake child support collections on behalf of children receiving foster care maintenance payments under title IV-E, if an assignment of rights to support to the State has been secured by the foster care agency. In addition, foster care agencies are required to take steps, where appropriate, to secure an assignment to the State of any rights to support on behalf of a child receiving foster care maintenance payments under the title IV-E foster care program.

11. Collection of spousal support.--Child support enforcement services must include the enforcement of spousal support, but only if a support obligation has been established with respect to the spouse, the child and spouse are living in the same household, and child support is being collected along with spousal support.

12. Modification in content of annual report by the Secretary.--The present annual report information requirements are expanded to include data needed to evaluate State programs.

13. Requirement to publicize the availability of child support services.--States must frequently publicize, through public service announcements, the availability of child support enforcement services, together with information as to the application fee for such services and a telephone number or postal address to be used to obtain additional information.

14. State commissions on child support.--The Governor of each State is required to appoint a State Commission on Child Support. The Commission must include representation from all aspects of the child support system including custodial and

non-custodial parents, the IV-D agency, the judiciary, the Governor, the legislature, child welfare and social services agencies, and others.

Each State commission is to examine the functioning of the State child support system with regard to securing support and parental involvement for both AFDC and non-AFDC children, including but not limited to such specific problems as: (1) visitation; (2) establishment of appropriate objective standards for support; (3) enforcement of interstate obligations; and (4) additional Federal and State legislation needed to obtain support for all children.

15. Requirement to include medical support as part of any child support order.--The Secretary of Health and Human Services is required to issue regulations to require State agencies to petition to include medical support as part of any child support order whenever health care coverage is available to the absent parent at a reasonable cost. The regulations must also provide for improved information exchange between the State IV-D agencies and the medicaid agencies with respect to the availability of health insurance coverage.

16. Increased availability of Federal parent locator services to State agencies.--The prior law requirement that the States exhaust all State child support locator resources before they request the assistance of the Federal Parent Locator Service is repealed.

17. Extension of medicaid eligibility when support collection results in termination of AFDC eligibility.--If a family loses AFDC eligibility as the result (wholly or partly)



of increased collection of support payments under the IV-D program, the State must continue to provide medicaid benefits

for 4 calendar months beginning with the month of ineligibility. (The family must have received AFDC in at least

3 of the 6 months immediately preceding the month of ineligibility.)

18. Guidelines for determining support obligations.-- Each State must develop guidelines to be used at the discretion of the court or administrative entity in determining support obligations.

19. Availability of social security numbers for purposes of child support enforcement.--The absent parent's social security number may be disclosed to child support agencies both through the Federal Parent Locator Service and by the IRS.

20. Collection of overdue support from Federal tax refunds.--Prior law requires the Secretary of the Treasury, upon receiving notice from a State child support agency that an individual owes past due support which has been assigned to the State as a condition of AFDC eligibility, to withhold from any tax refunds due that individual an amount equal to any past due support. The act extends this requirement to provide for withholding of refunds on behalf of non-AFDC families, under specified conditions.

21. Wisconsin child support initiative.--The Secretary of HHS is required to grant waivers to the State of Wisconsin to allow it to implement its proposed child support initiative in

all or parts of the State as a replacement for the AFDC and child support programs. The State must meet specified conditions and give specific guarantees with respect to the financial well-being of the children involved.

22. Sense of the Congress that State and local governments should focus on the problems of child custody, child support, and related domestic issues.--The act incorporates the language of S. Con. Res. 84 urging State and local governments to focus on the vital issues of child support, child custody, visitation rights, and other related domestic issues that are within the jurisdictions of such governments.

Cost estimates for the major provisions of Public Law 98-378 appear below:

TABLE 11-31.--CBO FEDERAL BUDGET ESTIMATES FOR CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT AMENDMENTS OF 1984 (PUBLIC LAW 98-378) [In millions of dollars]

		Fiscal		
year--				
		1984	1985	1986
1987	Total			
-----				
-----				
Alter incentive payments to				
States.....		.....	.....	15
15	30			
Reduce Federal matching to 68				
percent in fiscal year 1988; 66				
percent in fiscal year				

1990.....	0	
Require application fees;		
optional late payment fees.....	-5	-10
-10      -25		
Mandate State enforcement		
techniques.....	-15	-25
-25      -65		
Require IRS tax intercept for		
non-AFDC families thru fiscal		
year 1989.....	25	20
10      55		
Authorize funds for interstate		
projects.....	7	12
15      34		
Provide Medicaid for 4 months		
for families losing AFDC due to		
child support collection		
through fiscal year 1988.....	5	25
30      85		
Other provisions.....	15	20
10      45		
Impact of H.R. 4325 on CSE case		
levels:		
CSE expenditures.....	10	30
55      95		
Offsetting effects on public		
assistance.....	-5	-20
-30      -55		
-----		
Total.....	5	57
70      199		67
-----		
-----		

Note: The cost of disregarding the first \$50 of child support payments is shown in the AFDC section.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

The Tax Reform Act of 1984 (Public Law 98-369) was also

enacted during the 98th Congress and included two tax provisions pertaining to alimony and child support.

Under prior law, alimony was deductible by the payor and includible in the income of the payee. The 1984 law revises the rules relating to the definition of alimony. Generally, only cash payments that will terminate on the death of the payee spouse will qualify as alimony. Alimony payments, if in excess of \$10,000 per year, generally must be payable for at least 6 years and must not decline by more than \$10,000. The prior law requirement that the payment be based on a legal support obligation has been repealed and payors are now required to furnish to the IRS the social security number of the payee spouse. A \$50 penalty for failure to do so will be imposed. The provision is effective for divorce or separation agreements or orders executed after 1984.

The 1984 law also provides that the \$1,000 dependency exemption for a child of divorced or separated parents generally will be allocated to the custodial parent unless the custodial parent signs a written declaration that he or she will not claim the exemption for the year. Each parent may claim the medical expenses that he or she pays for the child, for purposes of computing the medical expense deduction. The provision is effective for taxable years beginning after 1984.

